

Redemption and The New Birth

T. T. Martin

FROM THE PRIVATE LIBRARY OF
THE REV. W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS, D. D.

WHICH WAS PURCHASED FOR AND PRESENTED TO

THE EVANGELICAL THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE
OF DALLAS, TEXAS

—BY—

WILLIAM NAIRN OF DUNDEE, SCOTLAND

NUMBER 3909

Dallas
Theological Seminary
Library

Redemption And The New Birth

By T. T. MARTIN



God's Plan with Men

An Interpretation of Salvation

12mo, cloth, net \$1.00

"In heart and mind and statement the author is true to the great central doctrines of sin, grace, salvation, and atonement. The style is vigorous, the theme is great, and the book most timely."—*Word and Way*.

Redemption and the New Birth

12mo, cloth, net \$1.00

The author of "God's Plan with Men" has written another essentially biblical interpretation of one of the fundamental doctrines of Christian life. The preface says: "The author is not a seeker after new truth. Why seek after new truth before we have mastered old truth? . . . Either the Scriptures contain all needed truth, and no new truth is needed and none can be found, or the Scriptures are not inspired."

Redemption And The New Birth

By

T. T. MARTIN, EVANGELIST

Author of "God's Plan with Men"

"For every sentence, clause and word,
That's not inlaid with thee, my Lord,
Forgive me, God! and blot each line
Out of my book that is not thine.
But if, 'mongst all, thou find'st here one
Worthy thy benediction,
That one of all the rest shall be
The glory of my work and me."



NEW YORK

CHICAGO

TORONTO

Fleming H. Revell Company

LONDON

AND

EDINBURGH

CANCELLED BY
DALLAS THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
LIBRARY

Dallas
Theological Seminary
Library

Copyright, 1913, by
FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY

New York: 158 Fifth Avenue
Chicago: 125 N. Wabash Ave.
Toronto: 25 Richmond St., W.
London: 21 Paternoster Square
Edinburgh: 100 Princes Street

PREFACE

THE author is not a seeker after new truth. Why seek after new truth before we have mastered old truth? before we have appropriated and moulded our lives by the old truth? Before we have led our fellow-men to accept and live by the old truth? There are men spending their lives searching for "new truth" who are not earnestly striving to pattern their lives after the teaching of the Lord Jesus; there are men eagerly striving to find "new truth" who have led very few of their fellowmen to grasp the old truth "worthy of all acceptance, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners."—1 Tim. 1:15. There are men excitedly chasing every blatant book labelled "New Truth" that they may give it to their people, poor sheep that

"Look up and are not fed,"

out of whose congregations year by year people die who know nothing of Redemption and the New Birth. Why seek after new truth when the old truth is inspired of God that the man of God may be "*thoroughly* furnished for *every* good work"?—2 Tim. 3:16, 17. Either the Scriptures contain all needed truth, and no new truth is needed and none can be found, or the Scriptures are not inspired, that the man of God may be "*thoroughly* equipped for every good work."—2 Tim. 3:16, 17, 1911 Bible.

The purpose of the author is to call attention to some teachings of the Scriptures and to some distinctions made in the Scriptures concerning Redemption and the New Birth, with the hope that they may be helpful to some who are seeking to lead others into "the old paths," and to some who are seeking "the old paths."

The work has been prepared in the midst of evangelistic work while the author was away from his library. This will account for some quotations without the names of the authors quoted, and for the omission, possibly, of quotations where they should have been used. "I have neither brought my sword nor my weapons with me, because the King's business required haste."—I Sam. 21:8.

Grateful to Our Father in Heaven for having opened the hearts of the people to receive his former work, "God's Plan with Men," the author now lays this volume at the feet of the Redeemer with the prayer to the Father that it may be used to the glory of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit in the building up of the redeemed and the salvation of the lost.

T. T. M.

BLUE MOUNTAIN, MISS.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	9
I. THE ONLY RIGHT WAY OF SALVATION .	13
II. LAW	25
III. REDEMPTION	49
IV. SALVATION	87
V. THE NEW BIRTH	120
VI. BEGETTING BEFORE BIRTH	135
VII. NO RIGHT MOTIVE BEFORE THE NEW BIRTH	173
VIII. NO REWARD FOR WORKS BEFORE THE NEW BIRTH	195
IX. ALL WHO ARE BEGOTTEN OR SANCTIFIED BY THE SPIRIT WILL BE BORN AGAIN	202
X. CLOSING WORDS WITH THE READER .	211

INTRODUCTION

THE author hopes in a succeeding volume to be of some help to honest sceptics. Such readers of this work are referred to some suggestions in the Introduction to the author's work, "God's Plan with Men." But this work is prepared with a view to being helpful to readers who are not sceptical.

The thoughtful reader must have noticed that in the Scriptures the new birth is apparently sometimes connected with the "belief of the truth," "the word of God," as its source, and sometimes apparently is referred to the Holy Spirit as its source. The reader of many religious books and papers has surely noticed that many lives manifesting decided changes of conduct have been put down as the result of the new birth, when these persons held widely divergent views as to the way of salvation. For instance, some of these books and papers tell of many people once dissolute, hardened in sin, who have changed and lived most devout, pious lives, who believed that the church would help save, that baptism would help save, that confessing to the priest would help save, that a good life would help save. Others of them tell of many who were once ungodly who have changed and lived most devout, godly lives, who believed that salvation is all in Christ, complete and eternal, without any church, baptism or moral character, and that service is the result of this

salvation and not in order to obtain it. Not only are these widely divergent cases told of in books and papers, but to the careful observer it is certain that many people who believed that church membership, or baptism, or confessing to the priest, or a good life would help save, have lived most devout, pious lives; also, that many who believed that none of these save nor help save, but that salvation is complete and eternal through faith in the Redeemer, have lived most pious and godly lives.

Now, if the new birth is the result of "belief of the truth," then those in both classes, though they all live devout, pious lives, cannot be really "born again," for beliefs so widely different cannot all be "the truth." On the other hand, if they are all "born again," then "belief of the truth" is not at all necessary to the new birth. Why be careful about the truth, if a person may be "born again" though he does not believe it?

Likewise, if one holds that the new birth comes from the Holy Spirit and not from "belief of the truth," and that therefore all of these devout, pious ones are "born again," though they differ so widely as to their beliefs concerning the way to be saved, then the question again arises, why be careful about the truth, if one can be "born again" irrespective of "belief of the truth"?

Can the thoughtful reader not see that this last theory either virtually does away with Christ as a Saviour, and the new birth as a reality, and is the old "salvation by character," or the older Pharisaism in a new dress? or that it virtually does away with Christ

the Redeemer as Saviour and makes the Holy Spirit the Saviour, and hence makes it that no real redemption is needed at all?

It is to the task of clearing away this confusion that this volume is devoted.

The purpose is to show that the new birth is the result of "belief of the truth"; not all truth, as that two and two make four; that a straight line is the shortest distance between two given points; that the earth revolves around the sun; but the truth that Christ redeems us from all iniquity (Titus 2: 13, 14). The purpose is to show that no one is saved, born again, till he believes this truth; that all who believe this truth are saved, born again.

The purpose is, further, to show that because *everything that is born was begotten before it was born*, the Spirit begets that which is afterward born again by belief of the truth; that the devout life primarily comes from the being begotten by the Spirit, but that the *right motive* of that life comes only after, and is a result of, being born again by "belief of the truth"; and finally, that all those who are begotten of the Spirit will eventually be born again.

If this be the teaching of the Scriptures, it will explain many cases that are considered by many as being the result of the new birth, where the parties do not yet believe the truth; it will guard from many mistakes in Christian work; and it will lead Christian workers to aim at leading the lost to "belief of the truth," which alone will save and produce the new motive power in the new life, rather than aiming to produce a change

of conduct on which to base a hope of a new spiritual force and call it the new birth.

There are many, many well authenticated cases, not of evolution of character, but of revolution of character, and of sudden revolution, in men and women who have been debased, hardened in sin. As examples consider the cases recorded in "Twice Born Men," by Harold Begbie, and in "Down in Water Street," by S. H. Hadley. The attempts to explain those cases on scientific, psychological grounds are lame and pitiable, and the explanations are glaringly inadequate. The only adequate explanation of them is that given by the Scriptures,—a new spiritual force. Let those who attempt to explain these cases on scientific, psychological grounds go and parallel these cases of spiritual revolution from infidel ranks, from heathen countries. Where is your book of "Twice Born Men" from any heathen country? Where is there a "Down in Water Street" from any infidel club?

Yet it will be shown that this new spiritual force does not always mean the new birth, but sometimes only the new begetting, to be afterward, at some time, followed by the new birth. But to make this clear, it will be necessary to go back and see man's real condition and needs and God's provisions for those needs. The reader can omit "For Further Study," and yet have the connected thought of the book.

I

THE ONLY RIGHT WAY OF SALVATION

To show man's condition and needs and God's provisions for those needs, let us take the case of men who have violated the State laws and who are condemned to a life sentence in the penitentiary. Two things are true concerning them: first, by their own wrongdoing they have so developed an inherited sinful nature that by their violation of the law of the land they have shown that they are an injury to society and should be separated from it. Second, they have violated the law and they deserve just punishment for their sin. So, all men, "by nature the children of wrath,"—Eph. 2:3, have so developed their sinful natures that they deserve only separation beyond the grave from the holy and the pure and the just who are in Heaven; hence, the sentence of the Lord Jesus who will be the Judge (John 5:22; Acts 10:42) at the Judgment Day, "Depart from Me,"—Matt. 7:23; 25:41. Second, all men have sinned, have violated God's law ("all have sinned,"—Rom. 3:23), *and deserve just punishment for their sins* ("Every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense

14 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

of reward,"—Heb. 2:2; "these shall receive greater condemnation,"—Mark 12:40, R.V.).

Now with the men who have violated the laws of the State there are six imaginable ways of saving them from suffering in the penitentiary the just punishment for their sins; and there are the same six imaginable ways of saving men from suffering in Hell the just punishment for their sins in violating the laws of God.

First, blow down the walls of the penitentiary with dynamite, and have no just punishment for criminals for violation of law. That would be anarchy. So, to save sinners from the just punishment of their sins, have God to blot out Hell, have no Hell, no just punishment of sinners for their sins. That would mean spiritual anarchy, and men who sneer at Hell, who ridicule the teaching that there is a Hell, who teach that there is no Hell, are but spiritual anarchists.

Second, in the case of the criminals go and petition the governor of the State to pardon the criminals and thus save them from the just punishment for their sins. That would be anarchy, just as much as blowing down the walls of the penitentiary would be anarchy. The pardoning power of the governor, save where new evidence has been found, is anarchy in principle. So, to save men from the just punishment for their sins, petition God, beg Him, pray to Him to let men off from the just punishment for their sins, without any just recompense. That would be spiritual anarchy, as much as it would be to destroy Hell and in that way

save them. Yet, alas! with the priests and with many preachers and with so many sinners, the idea is to petition, pray, beg God for mere mercy, to let the sinners off from the just punishment for their sins without just recompense (see "For Further Study" at the close of this chapter).

Third, in the case of the criminals, bring such influences to bear on them as to change their natures and cause them to love the laws of the State and to hate the violation of the law, and thus make them fit to associate with their fellowmen, and to become useful members of society, and then have the governor pardon them. That would still be anarchy in principle, an utter disregard for law, justice, right. So, applying the theory to sinners, let the Holy Spirit give men new spiritual natures so that they will love God's laws and hate evil and be fitted to associate with the pure, the holy, the just in Heaven, and then let God pardon them. That would still be anarchy in principle, an utter disregard for law, justice, right.

Fourth, in the case of the criminals, to save them from the just punishment for their sins, force innocent men to pay their fines for them and then free them. That would still be anarchy. So, in the case of sinners, have God to force the Lord Jesus to suffer the penalty in the place of the sinner and thus save them. That still would be spiritual anarchy.

Fifth, in the case of the criminals, secure the money by voluntary offerings and pay the fines of the men, and

16 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

thus save them from the just punishment in the penitentiary for their sins. That would not be anarchy, but it would be turning loose on society men who by their deeds have shown that they are not fit to be in society, and who would be an injury to society and to the State. So, let the voluntary suffering of the just penalty for men's sins by the Saviour redeem them from the just punishment in Hell for their sins, and take them to Heaven. That would not be spiritual anarchy, but it would be taking to Heaven those whose very natures make them unfit to associate with the pure and holy and just, and who would be an injury to Heaven.

There is but one other imaginable way in the two cases, and that is the only right way, that will do no wrong and result in no injury to any one. In the case of the criminals, let the money to pay their fines and save them from the just punishment in the penitentiary for their sins be secured by voluntary offerings; then bring such influences to bear on them as will so change their natures as to cause them to love the laws of the State and to hate all wrongdoing. Consider what will be accomplished by this plan:—the law will have been honored and not trifled with; justice will have been done;* and a good man will have been given to society and the State given a good citizen, instead of

* On the justice and right in allowing the innocent to suffer in place of the guilty, see the author's work "God's Plan with Men," pp. 40-42.

leaving a bad man in the penitentiary. Who but a fiend can object? Apply the same plan to sinners to save them from the just punishment in Hell for their sins:—Let the voluntary sufferings of the Saviour in the place of sinners redeem them from all iniquity (Titus 2:13, 14), and let the Holy Spirit give them a new spiritual nature that will cause them to love holiness and to hate sin. Consider what will be accomplished by this plan:—God's holy, righteous law will not have been trifled with, but will have been honored; justice and right will have been done; and beings hating sin and loving holiness will have been given to the Kingdom of Heaven, instead of leaving sinful men in Hell. Who but a demon can object?

The last is God's way of meeting the needs of sinful, lost men. Consider the two parts of it:

The Saviour voluntarily suffered for the sins of men: "I lay down My life that I may take it again. No man taketh it from Me, but I lay it down of Myself. I have power to lay it down and I have power to take it again,"—John 10:17, 18; "The Son of God who loved me and gave Himself for me,"—Gal. 2:20; "Our Lord Jesus Christ who gave Himself for our sins,"—Gal. 1:3, 4; "Our Saviour Jesus Christ who gave Himself for us that He might redeem us from all iniquity,"—Titus 2:13, 14.

That is what saves, the Saviour giving Himself for our sins: "For God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on

18 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

Him should not perish, but have eternal life,"—John 3:16, R.V. "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and *thou shalt* be saved,"—Acts 16:31; "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life,"—John 3:36. But this has reference only to the penalty for sins. The new spiritual nature is needed. "Can the Ethiopian change his skin or the leopard his spots?"—Jer. 13:23. Hence, "a new spirit will I put within you,"—Ez. 36:26. This new spirit comes from that Holy Spirit: "Marvel not that I said unto thee, ye must be born again. The wind bloweth where it will, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit,"—John 3:7, 8, 1911 Bible. And the one who believes on the Saviour is born again: "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God,"—I John 5:1; "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, *by the word of God*,"—I Peter 1:23.

But in the case of the criminals, there is nothing in changing their natures so that they would love the laws of the State, that in the least meets the just demands of the violated law; so, there is nothing in the new birth to meet the demands of God's just, holy, violated law. The demands of the law are met by the voluntary offerings that pay the fine. The just demands of God's law are met by the redemption of the Saviour; "Who His own self bore our sins in His own body on the tree,"—I Peter 2:24.

THE ONLY RIGHT WAY OF SALVATION 19

There is nothing in criminals discovering, by introspection, that there is a change in their natures, on which to base a just hope of escaping the just punishment in the penitentiary for their sins. So, there is nothing in guilty, sinful men discovering a spiritual change within themselves, on which to base a just hope of escaping the just punishment in Hell for their sins. *The only* just hope of the criminals is in the fines being paid. *The only just hope* of sinful lost men is in *Redemption*. God's law has been violated, and "apart from *shedding of blood* there is no remission,"—Heb. 9:22, R.V.

For Further Study.—The casual reader may think that, because of the Scriptures that refer to God's forgiving sins, it is contrary to the Scriptures to say that it would be spiritual anarchy for God, from mere mercy, in answer to the petitions, prayers, begging of priests or preachers, to let the sinner off, without just recompense, from the just punishment in Hell for his sins. But let the reader remember that while the English word "forgiveness" means mere mercy, to be let off without just recompense, the word from which it is translated does not mean that, but means simply to be let off from the punishment without saying *how* it is done; but God's word does tell *how* it is done. Two passages of Scripture will suffice to show this: Matt. 26:28, "This is My blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many for the remission of sins."

20 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

Here the word translated "remission" is the word for "forgiveness," but this remission or forgiveness, letting off from the penalty, is not without recompense, for the Saviour states that His blood is shed for that purpose. Again, Eph. 1:7, "In whom we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins." This is not letting off from punishment without recompense, for Paul states clearly that it is "*redemption*," and that it is "*through His blood*."

Another seeming contradiction to the statement referred to above is the prayer of the publican in Luke 18:13, "God be merciful to me a sinner." This is a mistranslation. It is the same word that is used in Heb. 2:17, "Wherefore in all things it behoves Him to be made like unto His brethren, that He might become a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, *to make reconciliation* for the sins of the people." The word translated "to make reconciliation" is the same word the publican used in Luke 18:13. Hence, the Revised Version has in the margin opposite Luke 18:13, "Be thou propitiated to me." But the Saviour in the next verse shows that it was not mere mercy without recompense that was meant, for in verse 14 He says, "This man went down to his house *justified*." If sinners can obtain mere mercy, relief from the just punishment in Hell for their sins, without recompense, what was the need of Christ dying? The infidel, the Unitarian, the Mohammedan, the Christian Scientist, the Jew, can

pray and pray sincerely, "God be merciful to me a sinner." But God has said, "Apart from shedding of blood *there is no remission*,"—Heb. 9:22, R.V.

A further seeming contradiction to the statement referred to above is the petition in what is called the Lord's Prayer, "Forgive us our sins." But let the reader remember that this prayer was not given for the unredeemed, but for the redeemed, for God's children. Notice the occasion of its being taught to the disciples: "And it came to pass that as He was praying in a certain place, when He ceased, *one of His disciples* [not an unredeemed sinner] said unto Him, Lord, teach us to pray as John also taught His disciples. And He said unto *them* [not to unredeemed sinners], When ye pray, say, Our Father . . . forgive us our sins,"—Luke 11:1-4. But God is not the Father of sinners. Jesus said to those who were rejecting Him, "Ye do the deed of your father. Then said they to Him, We be not born of fornication; we have one Father, even God." If ever sinners were to be told that God was their Father, here was the time. If God were the Father of sinners *in any sense*, here was the opportunity for the Saviour to have said, "He is your Father in one sense, but I am speaking of another, a higher sense, in which He is not your Father." Instead, He replies, "If God were your Father ye would love Me. . . . Ye are of your father the devil,"—John 8:41-44. "By nature the children of wrath,"—Eph. 2:3; but God "having in love predestinated us unto

22 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to Himself,"—Eph. 1:5, 1911 Bible, "sent forth His Son made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law that we might receive the adoption of sons,"—Gal. 4:4-5. Hence, "as many as received Him to them gave He power to become the children of God, even to them that believe on His name,"—John 1:12. How *can* any one do *anything* to *become* his own father's son, if he is already his father's son? But "they which are the children of the flesh *these are not the children of God*,"—Rom. 9:8; "for ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus,"—Gal. 3:26.

Again there comes up the question, if a sinner can escape the just punishment in Hell for his sins by praying, "Forgive us our sins," where is there any need of a Redemption at all? If a sinner thus gets rid of his sins, when the jailer asked Paul and Silas, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" instead of saying, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved,"—Acts. 16:31, why did they not say "Pray, 'Our Father—forgive us our sins'?"

A still further seeming contradiction to the statement under consideration is in 1 John 1:9, "If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." But let the reader notice to whom the "WE" and the "OUR" and the "US" refer. Notice to whom John is writing, 1 John 5:13, "These things have I written

unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God"; hence the first epistle of John is *to the redeemed*; hence, he says, "Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the Sons of God.—Beloved, now are we the sons of God,"—1 John 3:1, 2. The believers are the children of God and their Father forgives them on confession. The child gets rid of his sin by confession; the criminal, the one under law, gets rid of his sin by redemption.

Yet, in the face of the plain statement of John that he is writing to believers, those already God's children, Prof. Ernest De Witt Burton, Professor of New Testament Literature and Interpretation in the University of Chicago, who, with two of his associate Professors in the University, in their composite book "Atonement" (whose work will be considered further on in this book), labors with a zeal and an effort deserving a better cause to get rid of the plain teaching of the Scriptures that "Christ died for our Sins,"—1 Cor. 15:3, that "He His own self bore our sins in His own body on the tree,"—1 Peter 2:24, applies not only 1 John 1:9 to lost sinners, but applies the entire epistle to lost sinners. Hear him: "The doctrine of this epistle is, then, that acceptance with God, reconciliation with him, is conditioned upon a change of life to righteousness, but that he who does by confession of his sin turn his back upon his sin is forgiven and *enters upon a new life* in which there is

24 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

cleansing from all unrighteousness." Let the reader notice the italicized words. Again, "The condition of forgiveness is very definitely stated in the first epistle. 'If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.' 'If we confess our sins, he is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness' (1 John 1:3, 9). The use of the two terms 'faithful' and 'righteous' to describe that in God which assures *the forgiveness of the sinner* and his cleansing from unrighteousness is of great significance." But this is of a piece with the strained efforts of these three University Professors in their book to do away with the real redemption of the Scriptures, which will be noticed at length later on.

If a sinner can get rid of his sins by confession, then the infidel, the Jew, the Unitarian, the Christian Scientist, and the Mohammedan who confess their sins are all going to Heaven, and there is no need at all for a Redeemer, a Saviour. If sinners can get rid of their sins by confession, then when Peter was sent for to the house of Cornelius for the specific purpose of telling them words whereby they might be saved (see Acts 11:13-14), instead of saying, "To Him give all the prophets witness that through His name whosoever believeth on Him shall receive remission of sins,"—Acts 10:43, why did not Peter say, "If you confess your sins, He is faithful and just to forgive your sins and to cleanse you from all unrighteousness"?

II

LAW

“LEGAL fiction,” “legal myth,” “legalism,” “legalistic system,” “legalistic conception of the atonement,” “school of legalism,” “forensic view,”—are some of the flippant phrases of some would-be leaders of modern religious thought when they refer to God’s law and its holy, righteous demands. “Wherefore the law is holy and the commandment holy, just and good,”—Rom. 7:12.

Men need to call a halt and do some earnest, Judgment-facing thinking. Has God a right to have moral laws? Do men need moral laws? Shall men claiming to be religious leaders say that God should have no moral laws? that there should be no law of God against adultery, against stealing, against murder? Or shall men claiming to be leaders of *thought* say that God should have laws but without just penalties? Shall they be so foolish as to try to make God so foolish? Or shall they try to make God wink at crime and almost put a premium on crime by having laws with just penalties, but never executing those penalties? Any one who will think closely will know that a law is not a law without a penalty, and that a law with a

26 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

penalty that is never executed is a dead letter, is a travesty upon law. And any one who will think will know that that is the best government where the laws are right, the penalties just and the execution certain, without fear or favor. After transgression, is it to be desired that the law-giver should dispense with penalty altogether? Then why have a law? Why have penalty? "Law that could be relaxed could not have been holy, just and good."

Whence comes this modern popular teaching of relaxing the penalty of Law? Far, far back, there was one who taught that God would relax the penalty of law, "Ye shall not surely die,"—Gen. 3:4; and down the ages those who have taught relaxation of the penalty of God's law have been blindly doing this teacher's work for him (2 Cor. 11:13-15); for relaxation of penalty is his theology.

But Prof. Burton, Professor of New Testament Literature and Interpretation in the University of Chicago, goes even further in the composite work, "Atonement," than teaching relaxation of penalty, and says of Paul: "He never affirms that the righteousness of God demands punishment of every sin, still less that it could be satisfied or vindicated by the endurance of punishment by another than the sinner." Paul "never affirms that the righteousness of God does not demand punishment of every sin"? If the righteousness of God does not demand punishment for every sin, then why punishment for *any* sin?

Would God punish for some sins and not for others and yet never reveal for which sins man will receive punishment and for which sins there will be no punishment? But let Paul testify: "Our Saviour Jesus Christ who gave Himself for us that He might redeem us from *all* iniquity."—Titus 2:13, 14. Does not "*all* iniquity" mean "every sin"? Yet the Professor says that Paul "never affirms that the righteousness of God demands punishment of every sin." Why "redeem us from *all* iniquity" if the righteousness of God does not demand the punishment of every sin? Let Paul testify again: Rom. 1:18, "The wrath of God is revealed from Heaven against *all ungodliness* and unrighteousness of men." Does not "*all ungodliness* and unrighteousness of men" mean "every sin"? Again, 1 Cor. 15:3, "Christ died for our sins." For *all* or only a part of our sins? Again, Gal. 1:3, 4, "Our Lord Jesus Christ who gave Himself *for our sins*." For *all* or only for a part of our sins? Then if Paul be the author of Hebrews as President B. H. Carroll of the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary has unquestionably proven, Heb. 2:2 states just as plainly that "*Every* transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward."

Of a piece with this statement by Prof. Burton and with this trifling with God's holy law and God's word was the statement recently made by one of America's leading pulpit orators, one of the most prominent men in one of the great denominations that stand for

28 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

God's word and for real redemption through Christ. Before a vast audience just after the *Titanic* disaster, referring to some noble Jewish gentleman who went down with the ill-fated vessel, this prominent American preacher is quoted as having said: "I claim that a great act of self-sacrifice is itself a ground of divine forgiveness, and I don't believe God ever damned a hero." That may sound well as oratory, but it does away with all law and all redemption and is spiritual anarchy.

It is astounding to see how men, men who are leaders of religious thought, treat lightly and sneer at the subject of law in God's dealings with men.

Let us consider expressions from some of them:

Prof. Ernest De Witt Burton, Professor of New Testament Literature and Interpretation in the University of Chicago, in "Atonement": "That God loves men, even sinful men, his enemies, as the death of Christ shows that he does love them, is itself a refutation of the conception that he is a mere legalistic judge of men, ignoring their striving, their aspiration, and their faith, and pronouncing on them a curse because they have failed to fulfil all the requirements of the law." Ought God to have *any moral laws at all?* Shall there be *any* curse, *any* punishment, for the violation of these moral laws? If not, why call them *laws*? If there should be any punishment at all for this violation, and yet there should be *no* curse, *no* punishment, "because they have failed

to fulfil *all* the requirements of the law," for the violation of which laws shall men be exempt from punishment? How many of these laws can men violate and yet be exempt from the curse, the punishment? How often can men violate these laws and yet be exempt from the curse, the punishment? Where shall the line be drawn? Shall men be left in the dark here?

But the learned Professor sneers at God being a mere "legalistic judge." Why object to God being a *legalistic* judge? Shall He have no moral laws at all? Why have laws if there is no judge to execute them? Sneer at God being a "*legalistic judge*"? What other kind of a *judge can* any judge be except a "*legalistic judge*"?

Hear the Professor again: "If then even he endured the curse, the climax of suffering and the extreme symbol of divine displeasure, it cannot be that it is the law of the divine government that each is dealt with on principles of legalistic justice." "Legalistic justice"? What other kind of *justice can there be except "legalistic justice"*?

Again: "Men are redeemed when they learn at length, what the prophets perpetually affirmed, that God is not a bookkeeper recording in his ledger the daily deeds of men and issuing his curse on those who fail in any requirements of the law, but a righteous God loving righteousness in men, and faith by which men come into fellowship with him."

Does the Professor mean to say that we who believe

30 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

in God as a *just* God, as having just, righteous laws, and who believe in real redemption, do not believe that God loves "righteousness in men"? It is not for the "righteousness in men" that we believe God punishes men, but for their *unrighteousness*, their sins. Does the Professor by his "but a righteous God" mean to say that it would be *unrighteous* in God to punish the violation of His moral laws? If God does not issue "his curse on those who fail in any requirement of the law," *what law can men violate* and God issue no curse, no punishment, for the violation? Why have that law then? Or how many times can he violate it and there be no curse, no punishment? And how many of God's laws can be thus violated? Why call them *laws* if they are not to be carried out, executed?

But the Professor sneers at God being a "book-keeper." Why object to God being a bookkeeper? Which laws can men violate and God not set it down "in His ledger"?

The Professor of *New Testament Literature and Interpretation* says that "God is not a bookkeeper." Listen to the New Testament: "And I saw the dead, great and small, standing before the throne. And books were opened; and another book was opened, which is the book of life; and the dead were judged out of those things which were *written in the books*, according to their works,"—Rev. 20:12, R.V. and 1911 Bible.

Listen to the Saviour: "I say unto you, That every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment,"—Matt. 12:36. Does not that mean recording the daily deeds of men? Does that mean the trifling with any violation of any law?

If these two passages do not teach that God is "*a bookkeeper* recording in his ledger the daily deeds of men," what language would teach it? *Interpreting* the New Testament and changing and warping it are two entirely different things.

Let us next consider some deliverances from Prof. William James of Harvard University in "The Varieties of Religious Experience": "The very notion that this glorious universe with planets and winds and laughing sky and ocean should have been conceived and had its beams and rafters laid in technicalities of criminality is incredible to our modern imagination. It weakens a religion to hear it argued upon such a basis." Then that means no moral laws, or no execution of moral laws. Should there be no moral laws? Should there be no execution of moral laws? If not, then *why have the moral laws?*

But with whom does "it weaken religion to hear it argued upon such a basis"? The learned Professor says it "is incredible to our modern imagination"; then "our modern imagination" has gone far to sea without chart, compass, rudder, sail or anchor; for it means *no moral laws*, which means spiritual anarchy,

or taking the farcical position of having laws with no thought nor intention of executing them. It did not "weaken religion to hear it argued upon such a basis" with such men as W. E. Gladstone, Sir David Brewster, Lord Kelvin, James Orr and others. Shall those who think with the Harvard Professor say that these men are beneath "our modern imaginations"?

Prof. James again: "To-day we abhor the very notion of eternal suffering inflicted." But because "we abhor," will God change? The Professor had not learned, alas! that God does not go by majorities, and that a few University Professors and their students cannot change God. A man deliberately cuts off his hand; who is to blame for the suffering inflicted? God lets him live ten million years; who is to blame for the suffering during those ten million years? God lets him live through eternity; who is to blame for the "eternal suffering inflicted"? But the Professor had forgotten, possibly, the Revised Version rendering of Rev. 22:11, "He that is unrighteous, let him *do unrighteousness still*." If sin deserves punishment *at all*, and in Hell they continue in sin, then in the nature of the case there will be "eternal suffering inflicted."

Prof. James simply joins with Prof. Burton in rebellion against law, and in virtually advocating spiritual anarchy.

Let us turn now to the popular English writer, Mr. Harold Begbie, and here again we find rebellion against law. In his work, "Other Sheep," he says,

“This is really what the teaching of the missionaries—a teaching, of course, absolutely at variance with the goodness of Christianity—has implanted in the Indian mind. They have not said, ‘If you believe you will be saved,’ but ‘If you do not believe you will be damned.’ Their God is the Hindoo’s Devil.”

The author challenges this statement of the brilliant English writer; it is a slander on the missionaries of India. The teaching of the missionaries of India has not been “of course absolutely at variance with the goodness of Christianity.” It is not true, that “they have not said, ‘If you believe you will be saved.’” They have said it. That is not the trouble. What has brought down upon these missionaries the wrath of Mr. Begbie and caused him to thus slander them is that they have said, “If you do not believe you will be damned,” instead of what Mr. Begbie would have them say, “If you do not believe you are on the way to eternal destruction,” “you will not attain to the resurrection—you will be blotted out of existence—you will be annihilated.” Doubtless the missionaries believed the Saviour, when He said, “These shall receive *greater* condemnation,”—Mark 12:40, R.V., and saw that there *could* not be *greater* condemnation if, according to Mr. Begbie, they were all just blotted out. Doubtless they believed the Saviour when He said, “He that is unrighteous let him do unrighteousness still,”—Rev. 22:11, R.V., and saw that this last sentence of the Saviour against the lost *could not* be,

if, according to Mr. Begbie, they were all just blotted out.

But Mr. Begbie says of the missionaries, "Their God is the Hindoo's Devil." *Is that true?* Do the Hindoos believe that their Devil has moral laws "holy, just and good"?—Rom. 7:12, that the violaters of these laws will be punished *justly*, that every transgression shall receive a just recompense of reward (Heb. 2:2)? that their Devil loves them so that he has provided, justly, a complete way of salvation for them (John 3:16)? that he has provided a way whereby he can give them eternal life (John 10:28)? Will Mr. Begbie say that the Hindoo's Devil is this kind of a Devil? Then why thus trifle with sacred things? To bring in this would-be brilliant expression and thus slander the missionaries of India?

The key to Mr. Begbie's bitterness against the missionaries of India is not that they have not said, "If you believe you will be saved"; is not that their teaching has been "absolutely at variance with the goodness of Christianity"; it is found in two expressions in his "Souls in Action": "And yet it is this saving, blessing, joy-breathing, and life-giving Christ that has come to stand in men's minds chiefly and almost solely as a sorrowful Saviour from eternal torment, an intensely tragic and pathetic mediator between a doomed humanity and the wrath of a violent God." Why not say the wrath of a just God? the wrath of a holy God? Will Mr. Begbie say that there should be no

wrath against sin? "To be indifferent to moral wrong is the mark of a devil." Concerning the rejector of the Saviour the Scriptures say "The wrath of God abideth on him,"—John 3:36. If Mr. Begbie rejects this, where will he draw the line? What Scriptures will he have us to accept and what reject? Is he one of the modern self-estimated sages who know that the Bible is inspired only in spots and each of them is the only one who knows where the spots are?

Mr. Begbie again: "It is a mark of our potential divinity that we cannot worship a Monster or fawn a Tyrant." Is God a Monster because He will punish every violation of law and punish it justly? Is God a Tyrant because He has "holy, just and good" laws? Because He will execute them *justly*? "Every transgression and disobedience received a *just recompense of reward*,"—Heb. 2:2. Jesus foretells that the last sentence on sinners is "He that is unrighteous let him do unrighteousness still,"—Rev. 22:11, R.V., and in the very nature of the case, if sin should be punished *at all*, that means eternal punishment.

With these three writers it is not the injustice of future punishment—there will be no injustice—God is just: it is the old rebellion against law and the exactness of it.

Even Mr. R. G. Ingersoll stood more for law than do these writers. Hear him: "I do not believe in forgiveness. If I rob Smith and afterward I get forgiveness, how does that help Smith? If I cover some

36 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

poor girl with the leprosy of some imputed crime and she withers away like a blighted flower and afterwards I get forgiveness, how does that help her? If there is another world, we've got to settle. . . . No forgiveness, eternal, inexorable, everlasting justice, that is what I believe in."

Mr. Ingersoll, in the last statement, lays down that principle on which God acted in providing for the punishment of sin, and also in providing for the salvation of all who will be saved.

There are just four positions to take: first, that there should be moral laws and just, exact penalties for all violations of those laws; or second, that there should be no moral laws, which would mean spiritual anarchy; or third, take the attitude of the ignorant old farmer who, when his son had violated the law and was going to be punished, said that he was in favor of the law but against its enforcement,—which would be spiritual anarchy still; or fourth, relaxation of penalty. But this last would not be law.

Law, justice, cannot be swept away by a mere sentiment. God never tempers, reduces penalty. Men often pray that God will "temper the wind to the shorn lamb." God never does it. Make a test of it: shear your lambs and leave them out on the bleak mountain-side with a bitter, biting wind driving from the north, and expect God to "temper the wind to the shorn lamb." What is needed is the sheltering fold, and let the storm, God's law, beat.

Expect God to reduce the penalty? Take hold of a live wire and see; fall against a revolving saw; fall before a moving train. Christian Scientists say that there is no power in medicine, but swallowing half an ounce of prussic acid, or an ounce of carbolic acid will test whether God tempers the penalty. The shepherd wraps his cloak around the shorn lamb and lets the storm beat; the mother wraps her arms around her child and lets the storm beat on her. "A man shall be as a hiding place from the wind, and a covert from the tempest . . . as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land,"—Is. 32:2.

"Were a judge on the bench to have his son before him charged with a long succession of wanton crimes, and were he, because of the tears of a true penitence in his eyes, to dismiss him with a caress, what an outcry would be made against such miscarriage of justice! It would be denounced as a disregard for the sanctity of law, an imperilling of the moral order of the State." . . . "This is sometimes sneered at as a forensic view of the case, but the justice which is not forensic is not justice at all."—Clow, in *"The Cross in Christian Experience."* But as God is not the Father of the unredeemed, to make the case nearer parallel, if the judge were not the father of the guilty one, and because of the guilty one crying and begging and the crying and begging of the guilty one's friends and loved ones, he would dismiss him with a caress,

the judge would be denounced as a mere sentimentalist, as not being a *just* judge, as a perjurer.

Law, while knowing no forgiveness without just recompense, and while allowing no relaxation, admits a substitute and is fully satisfied with one wherever an adequate one can be provided, if the substitute is free from the law's demands, is willing and able: in works of public benefit, as working the road or street, a substitute is fully admitted; in military service the substitute labors, is wounded, dies, for another; with crime, wherever the substitute can meet the obligation, as in paying a fine; with debts, as in the case of a surety. But no sensible man of right principles would desire "the bliss of the culprit who beats the law of its just demands," its just penalty due.

For Further Study:—If part of the penalty can be relaxed, then why not all? Then why have the penalty at all? Then why have the law at all?

"It is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins,"—Heb. 10:4. Why not? Because that would mean relaxation of penalty. "Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me) to do thy will O God,"—Heb. 10:7. What will? Not to dispense with the penalty; not to relax the penalty.

"Even so MUST the Son of man be lifted up,"—John 3:14. Why? Because there can be no relaxing of the penalty.

The penalty is that "every transgression and disobedience received a JUST recompense of reward,"—Heb. 2:2. If not one would be saved, in Hell not one would be punished too much, "a JUST God,"—Is. 45:21; not one would be punished too little, "a JUST God,"—Is. 45:21. If all should be saved and not one be in Hell, it must be on the same principle, "a JUST God and a Saviour,"—Is. 45:21.

"The universe is not constituted and governed by laws with which God has nothing to do, or to which He is subject. If so, there is no room nor necessity for a God at all. There is no 'nature of things' independent of God; there is no 'power behind the throne' that rules Creation and the Creator." God's will is law. If therefore it is God's will that law shall admit a substitute whenever an adequate one is voluntarily offered, and if man admits the same principle with his laws, and the question of man's sin and God's violated laws is one that concerns God and man only, who is there to object to redemption save Satan and those in league with him?

Sin is debt. The debtors and the creditors are the only ones to be consulted. "Let all the people in the world pour money into the creditor's treasury, and the debt is not paid unless they have voluntarily offered and been accepted as substitute for the debtor. Even if it rains money, no amount of money in the hands of the creditor discharges the debt unless it comes from one who has been accepted as substitute."

40 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

“What makes people sneer at redemption is not the violation of law, but the *exactness* of it. It is that that the guilty always dread.”

There is absolutely no logical standing ground between the substitutionary view and the utter denial of atonement, and the consequent doing away with all penalty and law.

On one's right conception of the law turns the question of redemption; on redemption turns the question of the new birth; on the new birth turns the question of motive-power in life, and the motive determines conduct and moulds character. Let one look upon the law as a thing to be trifled with, to be set aside by sentiment, to be relaxed as a matter of mercy and expediency, and with him there is no longer such a thing as an eternal justice in God. With him redemption is then no longer a matter of justice and right, of “coming straight out and dealing with sin,” but merely “a way of getting around it”; “a mere theatrical display calculated to make an impression on the universe, and so to prevent the spread of sin, bring sinners to repentance and secure harmony and happiness upon the largest scale,”—Bishop. With him, then, in redemption God is no longer in holiness, justice and righteousness dealing with sin and His violated law as a thing that “is holy and the commandment holy, just and good,”—Rom. 7:12; but is working along the line of expediency, on the principle that “the end justifies the means”; in fact, is working out,

through it, the finest, smoothest piece of diplomacy the world ever witnessed. By such a view the motive power of life will surely be affected.

“The dishonesty now prevalent in our churches, the moral obliquity, the squint in the eyes, common to so many professors of religion, is chargeable to this false theory of atonement. Men listen to the preaching and they get a notion that the universe is a machine—that God is running it, and that He is behind pulling wires. What is the inference from this? Is it not that they, too, may pull wires? Men listen to the preaching and they get the notion that salvation is a piece of *diplomacy*. God is a diplomat. Why should not they be diplomats? God’s virtue is, ‘what is expedient.’ Why should not their virtue be ‘what is expedient’? With God the end covers the crookedness of the means; why with them should not the end cover the crookedness of the means? Nothing is more certain than this, that men will be politic so long as they believe in a politic God.”—*Bishop, in “The Doctrines of Grace.”*

The widespread trouble and confusions concerning the law and its just demands, and the consequent belittling of Redemption, degrading it from an awful and an awe-inspiring reality into a mere makeshift, or worse, a mere getting around the law’s demands, have all come from trying to make it out that God holds the paternal relation to unredeemed man instead of *only* the legal relation; whereas, God holds the pater-

42 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

nal relation with *only*, first, the Lord Jesus ("His *only* begotten Son"); and second, those redeemed from the legal relation and adopted as sons and born again; for the Saviour came to "*redeem* them that were under the law that we might receive the adoptions of sons; *and because ye are sons*, God hath sent forth the spirit of His Son *into your hearts* saying Abba, Father,"—Gal. 4:5, 6. (See the Author's work "God's Plan with Men," Chapter IV).

To start out with this widespread misconception and most deadly error that God is the Father of sinners, men easily drift into looking upon the law and its penalties as merely God's scarecrow to frighten His disobedient children home or to their duty; and they are thence led to slight the demands of God's law and to look upon it all as a "legal fiction." The next down-grade step easily follows, to pare down redemption into a matter of influence and expediency; and the next naturally follows, that the new birth is only the Holy Spirit influencing man's moral nature, leading to a change of conduct which secures salvation; hence, "salvation by character."

Starting out with the unscriptural belief that God is the Father of unredeemed sinners, which he stresses in his writings, it is little wonder that we find Mr. Harold Begbie, author of "Twice Born Men," "Souls in Action," etc., making in his books but slight reference to redemption, and teaching that there is no Hell, and the annihilation of the wicked. Hear him:

"The supreme glory of His revelation, that the Creator is the Father of men." Mr. Thomas Paine, in "*The Age of Reason*," says the same thing, "The Creator is the Father of all."

Mr. Begbie again: "Few people know that the immortality of the soul is a dogma of the Roman Church in the sixteenth century. 'According to the first Christian idea, which was the true one,' says Renan, 'only those would rise again who had helped establish the reign of God on the earth; the punishment of the wicked and frivolous would be extinction.' 'I know of no subject,' says a French pastor, who believes that the Romish doctrine of eternal torment has almost destroyed Christianity in France, 'on which the Bible is more explicit than on the destiny of the impenitent. It declares as plainly as possible that those who persist in turning from God are on the way to eternal destruction.' The *Encyclopedia Biblica* says of the heavenly Kingdom: 'The righteous rise to share in it; but only the righteous: the resurrection is only to life . . . the resurrection is conceived as springing from God . . . the wicked have no part . . . only those, therefore, attain to the resurrection who "are accounted worthy to attain to that world, and the resurrection from the dead"' (Eschatology col. 1375). Only in the mouth of Satan does the Bible suggest a universal immortality. . . . 'Ye shall not surely die.'"—*Begbie, in "Souls in Action."*

Again, from Mr. Begbie: "And yet it is this saving,

44 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

blessing, joy-breathing, and life-giving Christ who has come to stand in men's minds chiefly and almost solely as a sorrowful Saviour from eternal torment, an intensely tragic and pathetic mediator between a doomed humanity, and the wrath of a violent God. Humanity has rejected this idea. The American who closed a discussion on eternal punishment with the amusing judgment, 'Well, all I can say is that our people would never stand it!' spoke unknowingly for the healthy conscience and the clear reason of all the world. . . . It is a mark of our potential divinity that we cannot worship a Monster or fawn a Tyrant,"—"*Souls in Action*," pp. 22, 23.

Let the reader consider some things in reply to this lengthy quotation from Mr. Begbie:

Why should Mr. Begbie join with the rankest infidels in warping and say "a violent God" instead of saying "a just and holy God"?

He says that "humanity has rejected this idea." It ought to reject his warped idea, but will it reject the idea of a *just* God? If so, will humanity, by rejecting it, change God? Would humanity have a God without any justice? A God who would treat alike, blot out, annihilate, a giddy, ignorant girl of fifteen years of age, and a monster who had every ennobling influence in life and yet turned and in a lifetime committed a thousand cold-blooded murders?

As to the statement of the American he quotes concerning eternal punishment, "our people would

never stand it!" *they will have to!* Mr. Begbie and his American cannot change God. It can be said of these as Thomas Carlyle said of Margaret Fuller who was quoted as saying, "I accept the universe," and Carlyle replied, "Gad! she'd better!" The question is, *is there a revelation from God?* If so, bow to it. If there is not, what is all of this to any of us? Why should Mr. Begbie and all who line up with him in scorning the teaching of eternal punishment and who deny the resurrection of the wicked and teach their extinction, praise the Lord Jesus Christ and ridicule and abuse those of us who teach the resurrection of the wicked and their eternal punishment, when they are not our teachings, but *the teachings of the Lord Jesus?* Hear Him:—"Marvel not at this: for the hour cometh, in which *all that are in the tombs* shall hear His voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of judgment,"—John 5:28, 29, R.V. Why should Mr. Begbie reject this teaching of the Saviour, and then heap contempt on those who bow to the Saviour's teaching? Have we a right to pick and choose among His teachings? Is it a matter of preference or taste?

Again, "And these shall go away into the eternal punishment; but the righteous into eternal life,"—Matt. 25:46, R.V. What right have Mr. Begbie and others to reject the teaching of the Lord Jesus here and yet quote Him as authority on other subjects?

46 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

Again, "And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto Heaven, shalt be brought down to Hell; for if the mighty works, which have been done in thee, had been done in Sodom, it would have remained until this day. But I say unto you, that it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment, than for thee,"—Matt. 11:23, 24. Mr. Begbie knows that for the people of Capernaum and of Sodom to be in the day of judgment means their resurrection. If Mr. Begbie were simply protesting against the widely accepted teaching that Hell will be alike for all who go there, the author would most certainly join him, for the teaching of the Saviour and of the Scriptures is plain, that there will be difference in degrees in the punishment in Hell, according to one's sins, light, opportunity—"more tolerable"; "these shall receive *greater* condemnation,"—Mark 12:40, R.V. and 1911 Bible; "every transgression and disobedience received a *just recompense* of reward."—Heb. 2:2. (For a more extended treatment of the justice of future punishment, see the Author's work, "God's Plan with Men," Chapter I, pp. 17-31.)

Those who reject the teaching of the Saviour as to future punishment lose sight of a most solemn teaching of His, that the wicked continue to sin after death, which, in the nature of the case, will mean eternal punishment, if sin ought to be punished at all. Hear Him: "*He that is unrighteous, let him do unrighteousness still,*"—Rev. 22:11, R.V. If any one shall say

that it is horrible and unjust for God to permit the wicked to sin beyond the grave, the reply is that it is no more horrible, no more unjust to permit them to sin beyond the grave than to permit them to sin this side the grave.

The question as to future punishment is not to be settled by sentiment, nor by a play to the galleries in appealing to popular prejudice.

Those who deny future punishment lose sight entirely of *God's justice*. Ought sin to be punished *at all*? Ought sin to be punished *justly*? Those are the two teachings of the Saviour and of the Scriptures concerning future punishment. Men do not get just punishment for their sins in this life; for while there are many exceptions, yet along certain lines of sinning the more men sin in this life the less men suffer, for their consciences become hardened. And the plea that God punishes sin only to correct, to reform the sinner, not only does away with all law, throws justice to the winds and makes God merely a God of expediency, but it puts a premium on crime; for there are men in our prisons who, the more you punish them, the harder, the more incorrigible they become. If, now, God punishes the sinner only to reform the sinner, the only thing any sinner would have to do to make sure of Heaven would be to become such a hardened sinner that the more you would punish him the harder he would become, and he would have no punishment at all.

48 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

Let the reader grasp the fact that whatever Hell may be, *God is just, that He will do right*, that no one will in Hell be punished one particle too much nor one particle too little. "Shall not the judge of all the earth *do right?*"—Gen. 18:25.

It is said that at one time the United States Senate was divided up as follows: when a measure would come before them, one class would ask themselves, "Is it popular?" or "What is there in it for me?" Another class would ask, "What is there in it for my State?" Another, "What is there in it for my section of the country?" Another, "What is there in it for my party?" Another, "What is there in it for our whole country?" But there was one old Senator who would ask, "*Is it just? Is it right?*"

III

REDEMPTION

THAT it may be made clear what Redemption really means, let the reader consider carefully some plain cases from God's word:—

Lev. 25:25, "If thy brother be waxen poor and hath sold away some of his possession, and if any of his kin come to redeem it, then shall he redeem that which his brother sold." Here to "redeem" is a plain case of "pay for," "buy back." There is no intimation of, nor room for supposing, a relaxation of the price, nor anything else save an honest, just, straightforward buying back, paying for, *legal satisfaction of the legal obligation*.

Lev. 25:47, 48, "And if a sojourner or stranger wax rich by thee, and thy brother that dwelleth by him wax poor, and sell himself unto the stranger or sojourner by thee, or to the stock of the stranger's family: after that he is sold, he may be redeemed again; one of his brethren may redeem him." Here, again, is a plain, straightforward statement of what redemption is,—simply an honest, just paying for or buying back, *legal satisfaction of the legal obligation*.

Ex. 13:13, "And every firstling of an ass thou

50 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

shalt redeem with a lamb; and if thou wilt not redeem it, thou shalt break its neck." Again we have "redeem" meaning to buy back or pay for. A splendid picture has been given, by some writer, of this and of our redemption: A poor Israelite comes to the priest with the firstling of an ass; he needs the little beast of burden to help in making a living for his family; he is so poor that he has no lamb with which to redeem it, and he pleads for its life to be spared without redemption. The law is plain, and the priest explains that it must be redeemed or die; another Israelite, a neighbor, standing by, says, "Wait; I have a lamb"; and hastening away, he returns with the lamb and delivers it to the priest, and the little beast of burden is spared, redeemed. Suppose the priest, after taking the lamb, should also break the neck of the firstling of an ass? Every one would say that it was wrong, why? Because it has been redeemed, *paid for*.

Num. 3:11, 12, 39-49, "And the Lord spoke unto Moses, saying, And I, behold, I have taken the Levites from among the children of Israel instead of all the firstborn that openeth the womb among the children of Israel: therefore the Levites shall be Mine." "All that were numbered of the Levites, whom Moses and Aaron numbered at the commandment of the Lord, throughout their families, all the males from a month old and upwards, were twenty and two thousand. And the Lord said unto Moses, Number all the firstborn of the males of the children of Israel from a month old

and upward, and take the number of their names. And thou shalt take the Levites for Me (I am the Lord) instead of all the firstborn among the children of Israel; . . . And all the firstborn males by the number of names, from a month old and upward, of those that were numbered of them, were twenty and two thousand two hundred and threescore and thirteen. And the Lord spoke unto Moses, saying, Take the Levites instead of all the firstborn among the children of Israel . . . and the Levites shall be Mine: I am the Lord. And for those that are to be redeemed of the two hundred and threescore and thirteen of the firstborn of the children of Israel, who are more than the Levites; thou shalt even take five shekels apiece by the poll, after the shekel of the sanctuary shalt thou take them (the shekel is twenty gerahs): and thou shalt give the money wherewith the odd number of them is to be redeemed, unto Aaron and to his sons. And Moses took the redemption money of them that were over and above them that were redeemed by the Levites," etc.

Let the reader note this case very carefully. From the Passover night in Egypt the firstborn were set apart to God (Ex. 13:2; 22:29; Num. 3:13). Afterward the Lord arranged to take the Levites instead of the firstborn. God calls this exchanging man for man, redemption, "And Moses took the redemption money of them that were over and above *them that were redeemed by the Levites*,"—Num. 3:49. But in the

52 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

redemption by the Levites, it was man for man, exact; for when they were numbered there were of the Levites twenty and two thousand (Num. 3:39), and of the firstborn *twenty and two thousand two hundred and threescore and thirteen* (Num. 3:43). Now had *redemption* meant with God anything indefinite, any relaxation of a *just equivalent*, anything short of an *honest, just paying for*, one body of men would have been loosely exchanged for the other. But God was teaching the children of Israel, and through them the world, *redemption and its meaning*. There were two hundred and seventy-three more of the Lord's first-born than of the Levites. To have exchanged one body of men for the other would not have been *redemption*, for there were the two hundred and seventy-three men more in one body than in the other; hence the Lord's instructions, Num. 3:46-48: "And for those that are to be REDEEMED of the two hundred and threescore and thirteen of the firstborn of the children of Israel, *which are more than the Levites*; thou shalt even take five shekels apiece by the poll, after the shekels of the sanctuary shalt thou take them (the shekel is twenty gerahs): and thou shalt give the money wherewith the odd number of them is to be redeemed unto Aaron and to his sons." Notice the expression "*which are more than the Levites*"; then *redemption* is neither less nor more, but an exact, honest, just equivalent, without any relaxation whatever.

Now let us turn to the New Testament for redemption: 1 Peter 1:18, 19, "Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not REDEEMED with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation [Greek, behavior] received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious blood of Christ." Has God now, after, by simple, plain examples in the Old Testament, having taught us that redemption means paying for, buying back, a full, honest, just equivalent without any relaxation, changed the meaning of redemption into something indefinite, hazy, a mere matter of influence or expediency, and that without one *word indicating a change?*

Rom. 3:24, "Being JUSTIFIED freely by His grace through the *redemption* that is in Christ Jesus." Let the reader consider well this verse. It would be impossible for one to pack into words in one short sentence more emphasis of the Old Testament meaning of redemption than is found in this short verse: JUSTIFIED, not merely pardoned, not mere mercy, not relaxation of penalty; FREELY (Greek, dorean) absolutely without price; GRACE, wholly unmerited favor, when deserving the opposite; REDEMPTION, pay for, buy back,—absolute, honest, just equivalent; IN CHRIST JESUS, not in your deeds, nor in your character.

Heb. 9:12, "Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by His own blood He entered in once [Greek, once for all] into the holy place, having obtained *eternal redemption* for us." The redemption

54 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

is, as stated in 1 Peter 1:18, 19, "by His own blood," and not by showing us how to live; and it is "eternal redemption," "once for all," and not yearly. And there is no intimation of a change of meaning in "redemption" from its simple, manifest Old Testament meaning of pay for, buy back,—full, just, honest equivalent; no intimation of its now meaning a lowering of the standard, a relaxation of justice, a mere expediency.

Titus 2:13, 14, "Our Saviour Jesus Christ who gave Himself for us that He might *redeem* us from all iniquity." In this keystone passage, this passage that designates specifically just how many of our sins, just how much of our iniquity, the redemption through the Saviour pays for,—"*all iniquity*,"—there is not the slightest intimation that the Old Testament meaning of redemption, pay for, buy back,—a full, just, honest, exact equivalent, does not apply here.

Unless one takes the Bible to be, instead of a revelation from God that the man of God may be thoroughly furnished for every good work (2 Tim. 3:16, 17), worse than some take God's plan in redemption to be—a mere piece of shrewd diplomacy—a juggling with words, and that, concerning the great questions of man's relations to God and man's eternal destiny, then the redemption through the blood of Christ is an actual redemption, an actual, honest, just paying for,—a real, full buying back, an exact equivalent; and that it is eternal, and that it is "from all iniquity."

And that this is God's manifest, intended meaning is borne out by other Scriptures:—

✓ 1 Cor. 6:20, "Ye are *bought* with a *price*." Could language be plainer? actually "*bought*," and, as if to shut off misunderstanding, it is added, "*with a price*," the exact conception of the Old Testament redemption.

2 Peter 2:1, "The Lord who *bought* them,"—the Old Testament conception of Redemption.

Acts 20:28, "Take heed therefore unto yourselves and to all the flock, over which the Holy Spirit hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which He hath *purchased* with *His own blood*." God states that it is an actual "PURCHASE," a paying for, an honest equivalent, and that the price is "*His own blood*."

✓ Gal. 1:3, 4, "Our Lord Jesus Christ who gave *Himself for our sins*." ✓

Rom. 3:24, 26, "Being justified freely by His grace through *the redemption* that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His blood . . . that He might be JUST and the JUSTIFIER of him that believeth in Jesus." Here we have "the redemption" without one word as to any intended change of meaning from its plain, simple Old Testament meaning of paying for, buying back; and the statement that it is redemption in order that God might be JUST,—an exact equivalent.

If, as will be hereafter shown, no one is born again except by belief of the truth, and this is the truth,

then all objections to this are but the cavils of unregenerate men; for the objections do not come from the Scriptures, and the new birth *never* takes place apart from, or independent of, belief of the truth.

There is no saving power in the new spiritual nature, in the new birth. The new spiritual nature comes from the Holy Spirit (John 3:7, 8), but there is absolutely no saving power in the Holy Spirit. Let the Scriptures speak: "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that CHRIST JESUS came into the world to save sinners,"—1 Tim. 1:15. Notice that it is Christ Jesus, not the Holy Spirit, that came into the world to save sinners, and He came to *save* them,—not to help save them, not He to do part and the Holy Spirit to do part; and He saves them by redeeming them, actual redemption, by redeeming them from *all* iniquity (Titus 2:13, 14), and by having obtained *eternal* redemption for them (Heb. 9:12). Then the new spiritual nature, the new birth, does not save and does not help save, for that comes from the Holy Spirit, in whom there is no saving power. It will be shown later on in this work that no one is born again independent of belief of the truth; hence, *no one* who rejects actual, complete redemption through the blood of Christ is born again.

"Men like Martineau still plead with a passionate ardor, that they must not be ruled out of the Christian Church, or deprived of the Christian name, because they protest against the doctrine of the one

Mediator. Many more who believe that the man Christ Jesus was incarnate Deity, fail to rise to the height of accepting His ransom as a means of mediation. There are many mediations, they say, between God and man. A true penitence, a prayer of confession and trust, a meek submission to God's will, the germ of a holy life, God will not despise. 'The sacrifices of God are a broken heart,' completes their gospel. This cleavage is deep and wide. On the one side salvation is a redemption. On the other it is simply an illumination."—*Clow, in "The Cross in Christian Experience."*

Men need to face the alternative: that all who have sinned shall die in their sins, or that there is complete redemption through Christ. "One who knew no sin had, in obedience to the Father, to take on Him the responsibility, the doom, the curse, the death of the sinful; and if any one says that this was morally impossible, may we not ask again, What is the alternative? Is it not that the sinful should be left alone with their responsibility, doom, curse and death?"—*James Denny, in "The Death of Christ."*

And yet Prof. Ernest De Witt Burton, Professor of New Testament Literature and Interpretation in the University of Chicago, in the composite work, "Atonement," says, "It is not too much to say that Jesus did nothing, suffered nothing, that he did not ask his followers to do and suffer in principle, and, if occasion require, in fact. . . . He gave his life

a sacrifice for sin in no sense in which he did not ask that we also give our lives in sacrifice."

He says further, "No New Testament writer teaches the doctrine that the death of Jesus satisfies a demand of God that sin shall be punished, or is substitutionary in the sense that in it Jesus endures the punishment due to others." Over against this astounding statement put the statement of his associate in the work, "Atonement," Professor Gerald Birney Smith, Associate Professor of Dogmatic Theology in the University of Chicago: "To Paul Christ represented the sum total of the suffering which should rightly belong to man because of sin." These two Professors are the poles apart here. But Professor Smith explains, "The doctrine of the atonement took the peculiar form which Paul gave it because he lived under the sway of certain current religious ideas." Then there is no inspiration at all in Paul's writings! and this from the Associate Professor of Dogmatic Theology in a great professedly Christian University!

And Mr. Harold Begbie, the English writer, joins with these two Professors. In his "Other Sheep," speaking of why Brahmanism rejects Christianity, he says, "It rejects not the Heaven Father of Jesus, but the hostile God of the priest who must be propitiated and conciliated. It rejects not the love of God Who asks only for the love of His children, but the capricious arbitrariness of a God Who has made the

immense hazards of Heaven and Hell to turn upon intellectual assent to a set of theological dogmas." In the first place, God is not the Father of unredeemed men (Gal. 4:4-7). In the second place, Mr. Begbie rejects propitiation, in the face of the Scriptures "Whom God hath set forth a PROPITIATION through faith in His blood,"—Rom 3:25; "And He is THE PROPITIATION for our sins,"—I John 2:2; "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us and sent His Son to be the PROPITIATION for our sins."—I John 4:10.

But let Professor James Denny, Professor of New Testament Language, Literature and Theology, United Free Church College, Glasgow, answer these two Professors and this English writer. "In the Death of Christ," referring to the Scripture, "Christ died for our sins,"—I Cor. 15:13, he says, "Sin had involved *us* in death, and there was no possibility of Christ's dealing with sin effectually except by taking *our* responsibility in it on Himself—that is, except by dying for it." Again, referring to the Scripture, "If one died for all, then all died,"—2 Cor. 5:14, he says, "'So then all died.' This clause puts as plainly as it can be put the idea that His death was equivalent to the death of all; in other words, it was the death of all men which was died by Him."

Again, referring to the Scripture, "Christ also suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous,"—I Peter 3:18, he says, "The death on which

such stress is laid was something to which the unrighteous were liable because of their sins, and that in their interest the Righteous One took in on Himself.”——“This is His gospel, that a Righteous One has once for all faced and taken up and in death exhausted the responsibilities of the unrighteous, so that they no more stand between them and God.”——“If Christ died the death in which sin had involved us—if in His death He took the responsibility of our sins upon Himself—no word is equal to this which falls short of what is meant by calling Him our substitute.”

Let us hear this eminent, true Scotch theologian again: “We should remember also that it is not always intellectual sensitiveness, nor care for the moral interests involved, which sets the mind to criticise statements of the Atonement. There is such a thing as pride, the last form of which is unwillingness to become debtor to Christ for forgiveness of sins; and it is conceivable that in any given case it may be this which makes the words of the hymn (“Jesus paid it all, All to Him I owe”) stick in our throats. In any case, I do not hesitate to say that the sense of debt to Christ is the most profound and pervasive of all emotions in the New Testament, and that only a gospel which evokes this, as the gospel of the Atonement does, is true to the primitive and normal Christian type.”

“The man who thinks to offer God his poor faulty repentance as a reason in itself why he should be for-

given his sin, has never understood how heinous iniquity is, and never had a vision of the holiness of God.”——“When the lost sense of God is recovered, and the lost sense of sin is renewed, men shall find the grass-grown path to the old spring, and drink the water that Christ alone can give them,”—*Clow, in “The Cross in Christian Experience.”*

“O Cross that liftest up my head,
I dare not ask to fly from thee.”

— *For Further Study:*—Real redemption, an actual paying for, an exact, just equivalent, is an absolute proof that no one will be treated wrong in Hell; no one will there be made to suffer terribly and unjustly just for governmental purposes, to make effective God’s government on others; nor for its influence on others; nor for any other purpose. The suffering will be *just* and *right*. As the redemption which saves one from Hell was actual paying for, an exact, just equivalent; so that from which redemption is designed to save will be an exact, just equivalent of redemption. Hence, Hell, whatever it will be, will be exact justice, meted out by infinite holiness. Hence, it will be different for different sinners, and different for sinners with different enlightenment. And this accords with other Scriptures: “Every transgression and disobedience received a *just* recompense of reward,”—Heb. 2:2; “These shall receive the *greater* condemnation,”—Mark 12:40, R.V.; “It shall be more toler-

62 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

able at the day of judgment" for those with poor enlightenment than for those of great enlightenment (Matt. 11:20-24); they are to be "judged every man *according to their works*,"—Rev. 20:13. Why a redemption of actual, just equivalent, a paying for, if Hell is to be alike for all, injustice?

On the other hand, *the only ground* on which men can stand and contend for a redemption without justice, a redemption of expediency, would be that Hell is not going to be justice, that men are going to be treated wrong in Hell, without regard to justice; or that there is no Hell.

As a matter of fact, those who reject redemption as being an actual, just equivalent, and honest paying for, also reject the teaching of the Bible that Hell will be just punishment. Men claiming to be Christians make redemption an expediency and Hell a reformatory, and in both cases justice is thrown to the winds; or they believe that there is no Hell at all. Take, for example, Prof. Gerald Birney Smith, Associate Professor of Dogmatic Theology in the University of Chicago, in the composite work, "Atonement," put forth from the University of Chicago Press, by Prof. Ernest De Witt Burton, Professor of New Testament Literature and Interpretation in the University of Chicago; Prof. John Merlin Powis Smith, Assistant Professor of Old Testament Language and Literature in the University of Chicago, and Prof. Gerald Birney Smith. In this work, Prof. Gerald Birney Smith says: "The Cross

was not a device by which a faraway God enabled men to cancel their debt of sin."

Prof. Smith again: "To win the approval of God one has simply to achieve a character which will merit approval." That is pure heathenism; and where is the difference between this and Thomas Paine, "I believe that religious duties consist in doing justice, loving mercy and endeavoring to make our fellow-creatures happy"? What more do those who deny real redemption, substitution, claim?

Now, Prof. Smith as to Hell: "And if a man chooses not to do this, it would seem that the only hell which awaits him is the consciousness of being separated from a God whose presence he never wanted anyway." On this question Prof. Smith is at least a little in advance of Mr. Harold Begbie, who, in the face of the Lord Jesus and of the Scriptures, teaches that the wicked at death simply cease to exist.

Conversely, those who reject the teaching of an actual Hell of just punishment, almost to a man reject the teaching that redemption is a real redemption, an honest paying for, and an exact, just equivalent. And yet many of them masquerade as Christians! And having deceived their fellowmen into looking upon them as Christians, but of a "liberal," "broad-minded" type, they then deceive themselves into thinking that God will not see through the miserable mask. Would that they could realize that the mask will be torn away at that day, and they themselves

64 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

turned away to shame and everlasting contempt (Dan. 12:2).

— To accept redemption through the blood of Christ is the greatest way to honor Him, and to reject it is to trample His love and the Father's mercy. "He that honoreth not the Son, honoreth not the Father that sent Him,"—John 5:23. Said the Saviour, "He that rejecteth Me, rejecteth Him that sent Me,"—Luke 10:16, R.V. To reject the Redeemer, He Himself says, is to reject the Father, which is the greatest sin that can ever be committed; for the greatest sin is the violation of the greatest commandment. "Then one of them, who was a lawyer, asked Him a question, tempting Him, saying, Master which is the great commandment in the law? Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first commandment."—Matt. 22:35-38. This command is by the Saviour put above the commands against adultery and murder. Then to violate this command is a greater sin than adultery or murder; and it is violated by every one who rejects the Redeemer, for He said, "He that rejecteth me, rejecteth Him that sent Me."—Luke 10:16, R.V. "For the wrath of God is revealed from Heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, *who hinder the truth in unrighteousness.*"—Rom. 1:18, R.V. Truly can the words of the Saviour be applied to those who reject Him as Redeemer, "Woe unto you,

lawyers! For ye have taken away the key of knowledge; ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered"; for the key to the Scriptures, the key to the Kingdom of Heaven, is real, complete redemption. And our Saviour's withering sentence of doom was against such, "Woe unto you Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye shut up the Kingdom of Heaven against men: for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in"; for none so effectually shut up the Kingdom of Heaven against men as those who cut the heart out of redemption by using *the word* and yet take from it its real, Scriptural meaning; and those who are entering are thus turned away.

But the objection is raised that exacting the full penalty in redemption is harsh. It can just as well be objected that exacting *any* penalty is harsh. If there is a relaxation from a just equivalent and that is called mercy, and if a part can be relaxed, why not *all*? "Real redemption is God's supreme demonstration to the moral universe of the exactness and inviolability of the law." It is either redemption or Hell for all who have sinned, for to-day's obedience cannot pay yesterday's debts.

Men object to a "plan of salvation." Why? God has a "plan" in all He does, and His "plan" in the formula of sulphuric acid is not more exact than His "plan" of exact redemption, His "plan of salvation."

66 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

Salvation without redemption would mean that law can be violated with impunity. "The dream of salvation by some kind of escape from justice is a fearful, a fatal delusion."

Law, in its nature, provides for and is satisfied with adequate penalty, an adequate substitute, real redemption, wherever it can be provided. All nations recognize this. So does God. Or rather, God ordained this principle, and all nations recognize the justice of it. It is not recognized by all nations in the cases of imprisonment and capital punishment, for the reason that the State, as a matter of self-protection, cannot give up a good citizen and receive a bad one in place of him. But with God the new birth protects God's moral government from receiving, and being injured by, a bad citizen in real redemption.

The charge is made that actual redemption is immoral, that it is morally wrong for the innocent to suffer for the guilty. This is the citadel of opposition to real redemption, a paying for, buying back, legal satisfaction for legal obligation, an honest, just, exact equivalent. Let it be given full consideration, that its walls may crumble before the truth:—

Morally wrong for the innocent to suffer in place of the guilty? Where did the objector learn this? No enlightened nation says so; for every enlightened nation acts on the principle that it is right for the innocent to suffer in place of the guilty. Not from God's word does the objector learn this, for the Scriptures

teach positively that it is right for the innocent to suffer in place of the guilty. Where, then, did the objector get his objection? There are but two other sources from which the objection could have originated: from the great enemy of God, and of redemption through the blood of Christ, and of souls, or from the dark depths of a proud, unregenerate heart in rebellion against the exactness of God's "holy, just and good" law.

— Morally wrong for the innocent to suffer in place of the guilty? Where does the objector get his standard of what is morally wrong and morally right, when he rejects the Scriptures and their teachings as authority? Aside from the Scriptures, how does the objector know that the cruelty and debauchery of the Turk are not the ideal of Deity? The objector, by his objection, saws the limb off between himself and the tree; by his objection he puts himself over in the boat with Thomas Paine, commits intellectual suicide and is adrift on a shoreless ocean without chart or compass, without sail, rudder or anchor, and without one single guiding star in the sky. Rejecting the Scriptures, *where is your standard of what is morally wrong and what is morally right?* Without the Scriptures as the standard of morals, hasn't the Mormon just as much right to his dozen wives as you have to one? Without the Scriptures as the standard of morals, hasn't the mother on the banks of the Ganges just as

68 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

much right to pitch her child to the crocodile as you have to place yours in its crib?

The reply of the objector is that the enlightened conscience is the standard. Whose enlightened conscience? What is an enlightened conscience? Where is the standard by which to measure an enlightened conscience? How much enlightenment must the conscience have to make it the standard?

Another reply of the objector as to what is the standard for what is morally wrong and what is morally right, is the consensus of judgment of enlightened people. Then morals are to be decided by majorities; then "might makes right." But who are enlightened people? Where is your standard? How much enlightenment must they have that their judgment may tell what is morally wrong and what is morally right? Where is your standard by which to measure this enlightenment? Mr. Thomas Paine, after rejecting the Bible, the only standard of what is moral, talked glibly about what is moral, cruel, wicked, etc. Hear him: "Were a man impressed as fully and strongly as he ought to be with the belief of a God his moral life would be regulated by the force of belief."—" *The Age of Reason*." "His moral life,"—where is his standard of what is "moral"?

Again: "He would stand in awe of God and of himself and would not do the thing that could not be concealed from either." Where is his standard as to

what man would wish to conceal? as to what would be objectionable to God?

Thomas Paine again: "It is the fool only, and not the philosopher, nor even the prudent man, that will live as if there were no God." Where is the standard as to how man should live? Where is the standard as to how God would have him live?

Again: "It is incumbent on man as a moralist that he does not revenge an injury." "A moralist?" What is a "moralist" if the Bible is rejected? Where is the standard? The standard of the Mormon with his dozen wives? The standard of the bloody Turk? What is "moral" when there is no standard of morals?

Again: "The lies of the Bible have been the cause of the one, and the lies of the Testament of the other." Aside from the Scriptures, where is the standard of morals that shows that a lie is wrong?

Again: "The wicked use of pretended revelation." What is "wicked" if the Scriptures are not the standard? Who knows? Where is the standard by which we can tell what is wicked?

Again: "Repugnance we feel in ourselves to bad actions, and disposition to good ones." What are "bad actions" and what are "good ones," if the Bible is not the standard? Whose feeling of repugnance is the standard of "bad actions"? The Mormon's with his repugnance to our laws against polygamy? The Turk's with his repugnance to our opposi-

70 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

tion to his harems, and to his bloody cruelty? What are "good ones"?

Again: "The most detestable wickedness." If the Scriptures are not the standard, what is "detestable wickedness"? *Where is the standard?*

Again: "The only true religion is deism, by which I then meant and now mean the belief of one God and an imitation of his moral character." "His moral character?" How can we know God's "moral character" if the Scriptures are not His revelation? How can we know what is "moral character" if the Scriptures are not the standard? The only things that nature reveals of God are "His eternal power and Godhead" (Rom. 1:20). How can we know what is "moral" if there be no revealed standard?

But Mr. Paine, in an unguarded statement, reveals his standard for what is morally wrong and what is morally right, and at the same time the standard of all who reject the Scriptures' definition of redemption as paying for, buying back, legal satisfaction of legal obligation,—an honest, just, exact equivalent without relaxation: "Let every man follow, as he has a right to do, the religion and worship he prefers,"—" *The Age of Reason.*" There we have it! Every man has a right to follow the religion and worship *he prefers!* There is the long-sought standard, aside from the Scriptures, of what is morally wrong and what is morally right—and *that is worse than heathenism!*

And yet those who reject the Scriptures as God's

infallible standard of what is morally wrong and what is morally right, and who therefore reject the redemption of the Scriptures, an actual paying for, buying back, legal satisfaction of legal obligation, an honest, just, exact equivalent without relaxation, have no better standard; and then they presume to say that the Scripture teaching that the Saviour, through His blood, actually redeems us from all iniquity (Titus 2:13, 14) and eternally redeems us (Heb. 9:12), is morally wrong! that it is wrong for the innocent to bear the penalty of the guilty, to suffer for the guilty! And then they sneer and are offended if they are not looked upon as real Christians, but "broad-minded," "liberal," and the men of "the modern mind"; and they look with disdain upon those who believe in and preach a real, honest redemption, and with pitying scorn look down upon men who receive such teaching, among them such men as W. E. Gladstone, Lord Kelvin, Sir David Brewster, John A. Broadus, Prof. James Orr, and Prof. James Denny, as not to be classed with "the modern man" in intellect, and as far inferior to these men of "the modern mind"!

The legend of the eagle and the wren applies to Mr. Thomas Paine, and to the men who masquerade under the name Christian and occupy theological professorships and professorships in Christian colleges, who use Mr. Paine's objections to real redemption.

The birds, says the legend, arranged a test flight,

and agreed that the bird that could fly the highest should be the king of the birds. In the test the eagle flew higher than all others, and when, above all others, he had arisen to the limit of his strength, the little wren that had remained hidden under the feathers of the eagle's back, sprang up a few feet higher and claimed the decision. When Mr. Paine and those who use his objections to the Bible redemption have gotten their enlightenment and moral training from the Bible and its influence, have gotten their conception of a moral standard from the Scriptures, with their ill-concealed assumption of superiority they claim to rise above the Scriptures in moral sense, and denounce as morally wrong the Scripture teaching of a real redemption through the blood of Christ, an honest, just equivalent without relaxation. Men who believe in the Bible's real Redemption will admit all that is said against Thomas Paine's *open* infidelity; but many of them, because the men who use Mr. Paine's identical objection are in pulpits with a Bible in their hands, or in theological professorships, or professorships in Christian colleges, supported by the hard-earned money of God's redeemed children, will, from a horribly dangerous soul-deluding, soul-destroying courtesy, characterize them as *Christian* scholars holding "liberal" or "advanced" views as to Redemption, instead of letting the deluded people see that it is the old infidelity masked.

Wrong for the innocent to suffer for the guilty, to

bear the penalty of the guilty? Who is the great teacher of that theory? Hear him:

“Moral justice cannot take the innocent for the guilty, even if the innocent would offer itself. To suppose justice to do this, is to destroy the principle of its existence which is the thing itself. It is then no longer justice; it is indiscriminate revenge.”—*Thomas Paine, in “The Age of Reason.”*

Is it morally wrong for the innocent to bear the penalty of the guilty? Then the objector must charge God with teaching moral wrong, or he must say that the Scriptures are not from God; for here is the case: Lev. 25:47, 48, “And if a sojourner or stranger wax rich by thee, and thy brother that dwelleth by him wax poor, and sell himself unto the stranger or sojourner by thee, or to the stock of the stranger’s family: after that he is sold he may be redeemed again; one of his brethren may redeem him.” Let the objector, in the face of this Scripture, face the trilemma:—give up his objection that it is morally wrong for the innocent to bear the penalty of the guilty; or second, charge God with teaching moral wrong; or third, come out in the open and say that the Scriptures are not from God:—let a fourth be added—or stand before all honest men convicted of being a dishonest theological trickster.

A boy in one of the Southern States was horribly burned. It was caused by his own act. The doctors said that the only possible hope was to transplant

74 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

human flesh. Over the protest of loved ones, the delicate mother of the boy offered to have the flesh taken from her own body, to save her boy. It was done and his life was saved. Where is the moral wrong in this? Yet in principle that was the innocent bearing the penalty of the guilty.

A man by sin became an invalid, and as a result was utterly unable to make a living. A brother supported him. In principle that was the innocent bearing the penalty of the guilty. Where is there anything morally wrong in this?

A man of considerable property with a large family moved west, began speculating and lost everything. He moved back to his eastern home, suffering from lack of the necessities of life. His brother provided for him and his family and kept them from suffering. In principle that was the innocent bearing the penalty of the guilty. Where is the moral wrong in it?

There was brought before a judge in one of the Southern States a young man charged with a violation of law. The evidence against him was clear and positive. The young man's attorney advised him to plead guilty and throw himself on the mercy of the court, and he did so. The judge passed the sentence of the law, a certain fine or imprisonment. The attorney for the defence then pleaded the young man's family; that he was a minor, and that because of misfortune the mother had to make the living for the family with her needle, and that every dime of the

fine would have to be pricked from her fingers' ends with the needle, and that he therefore begged the judge to remit the fine. The judge replied, in substance, that that would be anarchy in principle, as the law had been violated; and that he would be a perjurer were he to remit the fine, for he had sworn before God to carry out the just, righteous laws of the State. The attorney pleaded that it was the custom of all judges to remit fines. The reply of the judge was that if all other judges made themselves perjurers he would not become one. Private pleadings and influence were in vain. After the adjournment of court, in another city the judge received a touching letter from the mother of the young man, recounting her misfortunes and hardships, acknowledging the guilt of her son and the justice of the judge's sentence, but stating that she could not let her son go to prison, and that she would have to make the money with her needle with which to pay the fine, and pleading with the judge to remit the fine. The judge wept over the letter, and wrote back that while he was touched and deeply moved by the letter, the law had been violated; the sentence was just; he had sworn before God to carry out the just, righteous laws of the State, and that he would be a perjurer were he to remit the fine, and that the sentence of the court must stand; and signed the letter officially. Then he added this postscript: "I wrote the above as judge of the court; I write this postscript as private citizen. As private

citizen you will find enclosed my check for the entire fine, Yours truly, ——, Private citizen." Where is there anything morally wrong in this? The Scripture and the Saviour are God's letter, postscript and check to this guilty, sin-cursed world. The young man could have destroyed the check and gone to prison. Even then he would not have been treated unjustly; so those who will may reject God's check, complete redemption through the Saviour, and in Hell suffer the just, righteous sentence for God's violated law; but God's eternal decree, "apart from shedding of blood there is no remission,"—Heb. 9:22, R.V., will stand when this world, drunk with its sin and pride, topples into Hell. But the sequel to the above incident,—the young man thus rescued by the sacrifice of the judge, turned from his wicked ways and is now one of the noble, useful young men of the South. And every man, without one exception, rescued by the redemption that is in Jesus Christ (Rom. 3:24), lives a purer, nobler life as a result of it. "And every one that hath this hope set on Him purifieth himself,"—1 John 3:3, R.V. The hypocrites and the unredeemed church members may not live better, but the really redeemed, without one exception, do live nobler, purer lives because of it. The young man, in turning to a better, nobler life, was moved by gratitude, love, but the redeemed are moved not only by love to the Redeemer, but by a new birth. But of this, more hereafter.

Not only is it not morally wrong for the innocent to suffer for the guilty,—*it would be morally wrong for the innocent NOT to suffer for the guilty*, wherever it can be done without causing greater injury. To cite a case used by the author in his work “God’s Plan with Men”: two men passing along the street at night hear groaning in the gutter of the street. Striking a match they see two men down in the gutter with their faces and bodies gashed and bleeding. Bending over them the two detect whiskey fumes. In a drunken street fight these two men have cut and almost killed each other. They deserve to suffer; they brought the suffering, the penalty, on themselves by their own sin. But the other two men take them, pay for a physician, pay the hospital bill and save their lives. In doing this they have done no moral wrong; yet in principle that is the innocent bearing the penalty of the guilty. To say that this would be morally wrong, would mean for the entire community to pass by day after day and see those two men lying in the gutter, suffering and dying, and not be allowed to relieve them. Not only would it be *not* morally wrong to relieve their suffering, *it would be morally wrong to let them lie there and suffer and die*, unless by the sacrifice needed to relieve them a greater injury to some one would result. For instance, suppose that with the two men who find the two wounded, suffering men, one has a child at the point to die and the other a wife at the point to die, and that, in paying for the physician and

the hospital bill to save these two from the suffering and death they deserve, they will be forced to neglect the child and the wife and let them die; then it would be wrong to bear the penalty for these two men. But where a greater injury to some one would not result, it would be morally wrong for the innocent not to suffer for the guilty, though it would be wrong to *force* the innocent to suffer for the guilty.

The principle that it is morally wrong for the innocent *not* to suffer for the guilty is taught in the Scripture: "Whoso hath this world's goods and seeth his brother have need and shutteth up his heart against him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?"—1 John 3:17,—he is guilty of moral wrong. The one charge against the rich man who let Lazarus die at his gate, unaided, was, "Thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things,"—Luke 16:25. It was not a question as to whether Lazarus was deserving or not; he may have been undeserving, but the rich man let him suffer when he could have relieved him. It is said that in Delmonico's in New York there was a banquet one night that cost fifty thousand dollars. While it was in progress a woman was found under the window of Delmonico's with a dead babe in her arms, and the police sergeant said that it had died from starvation. If the banqueters knew of it, in Hell they will suffer for their moral wrong. We are living on God's earth and under God's government, and every man is not an absolute monarch, an

independent sovereign in a wide universe; and God's law is, "Bear ye one another's burdens,"—Gal. 6:2.

Every benevolent institution on earth is a mute but eloquent witness to the teaching that it is right for the innocent to suffer for the guilty, and the contrary teaching would destroy them all and sweep benevolence from the earth.

But there is the limitation that wherever the innocent suffering for the guilty will result in a greater injury, then it is morally wrong for the innocent to suffer for the guilty. If paying the fine to save the criminal will make him a worse criminal, then it would be morally wrong to pay the fine. If paying the debt would make the debtor more prodigal, then it would be morally wrong to pay the debt. Hence, the limitation of the Scriptures, "If any man will not work, neither let him eat,"—2 Thess. 3:10, R.V.; it will encourage him in wrong; it will result in a greater wrong to relieve him than to let him suffer.

But with the Saviour's eternal redemption from all iniquity (Heb. 9:12; Titus 2:13, 14), no evil results, but only good; for instead of it being a premium on crime, the Saviour Himself said that the one who is forgiven most *will* love most (Luke 7:39-43); hence, "Every one that hath this hope set on Him purifieth himself,"—1 John 3:3, R.V.; for this reason: every one who is redeemed (1 Peter 1:18) is born again (1 Peter 1:23); the redeemed one has, then, the motive of love appealing to a new spiritual nature, and

80 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

the Scriptures state that this *in every case* leads the redeemed one to purify himself (1 John 3:3).

Instead, therefore, of the innocent suffering for the guilty being morally wrong, it produces morality. The Scriptures so teach; reason bears it out; and the lives of multiplied thousands of drunkards and harlots who have been redeemed bear unimpeachable witness to this truth. The history of Christianity is the history of the revolution of such lives. Let the reader, for testimony along this line, turn to "Down in Water Street," by S. H. Hadley, or "Pastor Hsi," of China, by Mrs. Howard Taylor. Further on the author will give authentic cases from his own work.

The morality produced by real redemption from all iniquity is of the highest, purest type; for let the reader not lose sight of the fact that the deed gets its moral quality alone from the motive prompting the deed. Two men show you a kindness; the deeds are the same; one is from pure love and friendship; the other that he may win your confidence and swindle you. The moral quality of the deed is in the motive.

Having considered some of the objections to the plain teaching of the Scriptures as to redemption, it remains now to face a most insidious attack on this central, all-important teaching. The composite work, "Atonement," by the three Theological Professors of the University of Chicago, Profs. Smith, Burton and Smith, referred to above, is a most delusive effort to wrest the Scriptures from their manifest meaning. It

is true that they use biblical terms, though with unscriptural meanings; but he is most dangerous who leaves the good label on the bottle but puts poison in the bottle. For example, Prof. Burton: "Redemption from the curse of the law is not forgiveness of sins but deliverance of the mind from a misconception of God's attitude toward men." Why use the word "redemption," then?

Again: "Men are redeemed when they learn at length what the prophets perpetually affirmed, that God is not a bookkeeper recording in his ledger the daily deeds of men and issuing his curse on those who fail in any requirement of the law, but a righteous God, loving righteousness in men, and faith by which men come into fellowship with him." Let it be asked again, Why use the word "redemption"?

Again: "It is by the knowledge of God that men are redeemed." Why use the word "redemption"? Why juggle with words?

Again: "By its revelation of ideal human life the death of Jesus becomes redemptive." "Redemptive?"

Again: "The death of Jesus is effective in that it discloses the principle of living which, being the principle of God's own life, must become the principle of human lives in order that they may be reconciled to God."

Again: "Adoption of that principle of life which

82 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

Jesus exemplified pre-eminently in his death, is the basis of forgiveness and acceptance with God."

Again: "It is not too much to say that Jesus did nothing, suffered nothing, that he did not ask his followers to do and suffer in principle, and, if occasion require, in fact, . . . He gave his life a sacrifice for sin in no sense in which he did not ask that we also give our lives in sacrifice."

With this as the teaching of the Professor of New Testament Literature and Interpretation in the University of Chicago, what may the churches expect from the young preachers educated there?

But in this composite work, "Atonement," by the three Theological Professors in the University of Chicago, Prof. John Merlin Powis Smith eclipses even Prof. Burton in his effort to wrest the Scriptures so as to evade their teaching concerning real redemption, substitution. After stating that in the Prophets and Deuteronomy, "Resolute turning away from evil is the only thing required"; and "A humble and contrite heart is the only recommendation the sinner needs with God. It is precisely the kind of atonement that every right-minded parent desires from a wayward child—a genuine repentance including sorrow for past offences and determination henceforth to exhibit filial obedience and love"; Prof. Smith proceeds with his strained interpretation of Isaiah 52:13-53:12, the evident object of which is to contribute to and bolster up the manifest purpose of the book to literally do

away with real redemption, substitution. Hear him:—

“Reverting once more to the prophetic teachings concerning atonement, we are confronted by that most famous of all prophesies, Isa. 52:13-53:12. This is a narrative of the bitter experiences of the Servant of Jehovah with a prediction of his coming glorification. . . . The Servant here described *is the people of Israel*, the nation as a whole and not any part of it, nor any individual member of it. . . . The purpose of the prophecy is *not to explain how atonement is wrought out for sinners*. . . . The reason for the suffering is found, *not in the sins of Israel* but in those of the heathen nations. The penalty due their sins has been *borne by Israel*. He has suffered in their place. No thought appears so frequently in the passage as this of the righteous Servant’s *substitution for the wicked* (vss. 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12). The thought is that of vicarious satisfaction of the demands made by the divine righteousness. For the Hebrews the character of God made it necessary that he should punish sin. . . . He sought to cheer suffering Israel by showing the large meaning of the exilic experiences and revealing their vital import in bringing the world to a knowledge of the true God.”

It would be interesting to see what shift Prof. Smith, who thus makes this noted passage mean that the sufferer “is the people of Israel” bearing the penalty due the sins “of the heathen nations,” would use

in explaining how in verse 9 the expression "with the rich in his death" applies to the people of Israel, when "the rich" in the Hebrew is in the singular. Laying aside the wild straining in his wild interpretation to make the grave, the death, and the resurrection referred to in the prophecy apply to the people of Israel, with what "the rich" (one, singular) was Israel associated in this figurative death?

But why should it be such a terrible teaching that Christ bore the penalty due our sins, suffered in our place, that this composite book is put out to destroy that teaching, and yet it be morally right for *the people of Israel* to bear the penalty due the sins of *the heathen nations* and suffer in their place? How can it be morally right for *Israel* to bear the penalty for the sins of *the heathen nations*, and morally wrong for Jesus to bear our sins?

But let the reader note with what coolness Prof. Smith states positively, "The Servant here described is the people of Israel, the nation as a whole and not any part of it, nor any individual member of it." Over against this let the reader notice carefully that John says that the passage refers to the Saviour (John 12:38); Paul says that it refers to the Saviour (Rom. 10:16; 15:21); Peter refers it to the Saviour (1 Peter 2:24, 25); Matthew says that it refers to the Saviour (Matt. 8:17); Luke says that it refers to the Saviour (Acts 8:35); Mark says that it refers to the Saviour (Mark 15:28); Philip understood it to refer to the

Saviour (Acts 8:35); Jesus said that it referred to Him (Mark 9:12; Luke 22:37). Yet Prof. Smith, of the University of Chicago, says that all these were mistaken; that he himself knows better what this passage means than the apostles John, Paul, Peter and Matthew; than Luke, Mark and Philip; than Jesus Himself! Prof. James Denny says, "Most people, of course, are conscious that they do not look well talking down to Paul"; yet here is one who, apparently without any conscious embarrassment, talks down to all these; and with calm self-assurance writes himself down as superior in knowledge, on this question, to Him who prayed the Father "Glorify Thou Me with Thine own self with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was."

One does not like to protest; but when a great Christian University with millions of money back of it sends out such teaching from three associated Theological Professors, it is time to speak. It is not a matter of bandying epithets on the one hand, nor of showing criminal courtesy on the other. These three Theological Professors seem not to realize that this question of real redemption is not a matter of theological gymnastics, nor of intellectual legerdemain, but a question of the eternal destiny of souls; that if "Apart from shedding of blood there is no remission,"—Heb. 9:22, R.V., then every one influenced by their teaching and the teachings of the young preachers trained by them is lost and lost forever. Hence

86 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

the apostle Paul says, " Though we or an angel from Heaven preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, If any one preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed,"—Gal. 1:8, 9. Hence, the solemn, weighty words of the Scotch theologian, James Denny, Professor of the New Testament Language, Literature and Theology, United Free Church College, Glasgow, " As there is only one God, so there can be only one gospel. If God has really done something in Christ on which the salvation of the world depends, and if He has made it known, then it is a Christian duty to be intolerant of everything which ignores, denies, or explains it away. The man who perverts it is the worst enemy of God and men. . . . Intolerance like this is an essential element in the true religion; it is the instinct of self-preservation in it; the unforced and uncompromising defence of that on which the glory of God and the salvation of the world depend. If the evangelist has not something to preach of which he can say, If any man makes it his business to subvert this, let him be anathema, he has no gospel at all."

IV

SALVATION

“THE Son of man is come to seek and to save that which is lost,”—Luke 19:10. The one who is lost is the one who has sinned: “The soul that sinneth it shall die,”—Ez. 18:4. The lost one is under just penalty for every sin. “Every transgression and disobedience received a *just* recompense of reward,”—Heb. 2:2. “These shall receive the greater condemnation,”—Mark 12:40, R.V. “Judged *every one according to their works*,”—Rev. 20:13. To be rescued from this just penalty, to be safe from this just penalty, is to be saved. Hence, when the jailer asked, “What must I do to be saved?”—Acts 16:30, the answer was, “Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved,”—Acts 16:31; not, “Believe in the Holy Spirit and on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.” But why does that save? Because, “Christ died for our sins,”—1 Cor. 15:3; “Our Lord Jesus Christ who gave Himself for our sins,”—Gal. 1:3, 4; “neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by His own blood He entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us,”—Heb. 9:12; “our Saviour Jesus

88 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

Christ who gave Himself for us, that He might redeem us from all iniquity,"—Titus 2:13, 14. But the new spiritual nature is from the Holy Spirit: "Marvel not that I said unto you, ye must be born again. The wind bloweth where it will, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth: So is every one that is born of the Spirit,"—John 3, 7, 8. Then salvation is not in the new birth, but wholly in Christ dying for our sins. When, therefore, one believes on Christ, he is saved, and not when he dies, and not at the judgment.

That this is the teaching of God's word, will be made clear from the following Scriptures:

Eph. 2:8, R.V. and 1911 Bible, "By grace *have ye been saved* through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God." Here the matter of the salvation of the Ephesian Christians is put before us as a completed act, and as having been completed in the past, and not as dependent on continued faith, and not to be completed at some future time. A vast proportion of people have a cloud of more or less density hanging over their future because they conceive of salvation as being contingent on their baptism, or their church relationship, or their continued good life, or their continued faith,—something in the future, in this life, to be finally fixed, settled at death or at the judgment; whereas God says, "He that believeth on the Son HATH everlasting life,"—John 3:36; the Saviour says, "Verily, verily I say

unto you, he that believeth on Me hath everlasting life,"—John 6:47; Paul says, "By grace have ye been saved through faith,"—R.V. and 1911 Bible; and the Saviour says, "Verily, verily I say unto you, he that heareth My word and believeth on Him that sent Me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life,"—John 5:24.

Rom. 7:4, R.V. and 1911 Bible, "Wherefore, my brethren, ye also were made dead to the law through the body of Christ; that ye should be joined to another, even to Him who was raised from the dead." There can be no middle ground; one is either alive to the law or dead to the law; and the transition from the state of being alive to the law to that of being dead to the law is instantaneous, complete in an instant, and it was a past fact to those to whom Paul was writing. The context teaches clearly a change of state here and now. Notice it: "The woman that hath an husband is bound by the law to the husband so long as he liveth: but if the husband is dead she is loosed from the law of the husband. So then if, while the husband liveth, she is married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress; but if the husband dieth, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she is married to another man,"—Rom. 7:2, 3. The apostle uses this as illustrating our salvation. It shows a complete change of state here and now. The first husband is not partly dead and

90 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

the wife partly married to another man and will be completely married to another man when the first husband is completely dead. But the first act is completed, the first husband completely dead, before she is married to another man; then she is completely married to the other man and not partly. Then the apostle applies this to believers: "Wherefore, my brethren, ye also *were made dead* to the law through the body of Christ; that ye should be joined to another,"—Rom. 7:4. Continuing, he completes the application, "Now we *have been* set free from the law, *having died* to that wherein we were held,"—Rom. 7:6. He puts before us the old relation as completed, past, for the Christian, and the new relation as already established; hence, that salvation is, here and now, a completed act.

Rom. 6:14, "Ye are not under the law, but under grace." There can be no such condition as being partly under the law and partly not, partly saved and partly lost; and the apostle's statement is clear and positive, "*Ye are not under the law.*" Why not? Because "ye also *were made dead* to the law through the body of Christ,"—Rom. 7:4.

Gal. 4:4-7, "When the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth His Son, born of a woman, born under the law, to redeem them that *were under* the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. And because ye *are* Sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying Abba, Father; where-

fore thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ." There are the two relations, those under the law, and those that have been redeemed from under the law and adopted as sons, and Paul refers to the transition from one state to the other as already a completed fact, "*were* under the law," "and because ye *are* sons," not under the law, here and now; and he adds that we never return to the former state (Gal. 4:7).

2 Tim. 1:12, "I know whom I *have* believed and am persuaded that He is able to keep that which I *have committed* to Him against that day." The believing, the committing, are both past, completed acts, not continuous. It is true, that when one has been led to exercise faith in Christ, that faith will continue, for faith only changes as the object of faith changes; but salvation does not depend on the faith continuing; for he that believeth on the Son *hath* everlasting life,"—John 3:36, not "will have if the faith continues till death." Hence, Paul says "*have* believed," not "am believing." A man and woman agree to be husband and wife; the one properly authorized pronounces them husband and wife. The faith that made them husband and wife is now completed, a past act. Hence, "by grace *have ye been* saved, through faith,"—Eph. 2:8, R.V. and 1911 Bible. Paul says, "I *have* committed" not, "am committing," but a past completed act. A letter is committed to the post-office in New York to go to San Francisco. It is one instantaneous,

92 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

completed act, not to be continued, not to be repeated when the mail-train gets to Chicago, and again at Kansas City, and again in Denver and again in Salt Lake City; but committed *once*, and *once for all*; hence Paul says, "I *have* committed to Him *against that day*."

Let the reader pause and face the question: Is the matter of the reader's salvation, his eternal destiny, a past, completed matter? Is the reader already saved, safe, sure of Heaven? Let it be clearly understood that the Scriptures put the question of salvation as a past, completed matter for the real Christian, that it is not contingent at all, not dependent on anything to be continued or repeated; "I have committed to Him *against that day*." When one commits a package to the express company in Philadelphia to be delivered in New Orleans, the act is instantaneous, completed, past, not to be continued, nor repeated. There is not repeated committal in Washington City, nor in Atlanta, nor in Montgomery; but a committal once for all. When one commits money to the bank for twelve months, there is no more committing, no daily committing. So when one *has* committed his salvation, the work of his soul being saved, to Christ "against that day," there is no daily re-committal, but an instantaneous, completed matter.

To commit means to transfer responsibility, and that is done, is completed, in a moment. To commit a letter to the post-office means that the entire re-

sponsibility for its safe delivery rests on the post-office department, and none on the one committing the letter; and that if there should be any failure, it would be the post-office department's failure and not the failure of the one committing the letter. So when one commits the work of his soul being saved to Christ, it means that the whole responsibility of that soul being saved rests on the Saviour, and none on the one committing; and that if there should be any failure of that soul's reaching Heaven it would be wholly the Saviour's failure and not the failure of the one committing. To commit one's money to a bank for twelve months means that the entire responsibility for the safety of the money for every moment of the twelve months rests on the bank and none whatever on the one committing the money; and that if there should be any failure as to the safety of the money it would be solely the bank's failure. So, blessed, blessed fact! when one has committed the matter of his soul's salvation to the Saviour "against that day," as Paul did, the entire responsibility for the safety of that soul for every moment until "that day" rests solely upon the Saviour; and if there should be any failure as to that soul's safety, it would be wholly the Saviour's failure.

To commit a package to an express company to be delivered to a certain destination means that the entire responsibility for its safe delivery passes off from the one committing and upon the express company,

94 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

and that if there should be any failure, it would not be the failure of the one committing, but the failure of the express company. Even so, when one has, as did the apostle, committed his soul's reaching Heaven unto the Saviour "against that day," at that very moment the whole responsibility for the soul's reaching Heaven no longer rests on the one committing, but upon the Saviour; and if there should be any failure of that soul's reaching Heaven, the responsibility for the failure would rest, not in the least upon the one committing, but upon the Saviour. But this transfer of responsibility is in a moment of time; hence, salvation is a completed matter the moment one believes on the Saviour.

John 5:24, "Verily, verily I say unto you, he that heareth My word and believeth on Him that sent Me, *hath* everlasting life and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life." Here again the Scriptures make it clear that salvation is instantaneous and complete, and not dependent on anything in the future, neither continuance of faith, nor continuance of good works, nor anything else in the future. To make this clear from this verse, take a simple illustration: a minister is preaching on John 5:24 as a text. Suddenly twelve men arise in the audience and each one confesses that he has then and there believed on Him, rested his soul's eternal destiny on Him. Imagine that there are twelve ministers representing twelve different churches, on the platform

with the minister who is preaching, and that the twelve men start at once down the aisle, each to be received into some one of the twelve different churches represented by the twelve different ministers. Before they arose they had not believed on Him; now they have. Scientists tell us that the human mind acts in the eighth part of a second; then before the twelve men can get to the ministers, before they can step into the aisle, Jesus says that each one "hath everlasting life," before he can possibly be received into any church, and before he can possibly be baptized. And the Saviour adds, "and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life." Then Salvation is complete and instantaneous.

But in each of these Scriptures which teach salvation to be complete and instantaneous, the whole of salvation rests upon the Saviour alone, and no part on the new birth; for "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners,"—1 Tim. 1:15, and not the Holy Spirit; and the new spiritual nature comes from the Holy Spirit and not from the Saviour (John 3:7, 8); and so the Holy Spirit has no saving power, and neither is there any saving power in the new birth.

Because of not realizing, or not keeping in mind, the distinction between salvation alone through faith in the Saviour as Redeemer and the new nature coming from the Holy Spirit, and that there is no saving power in the Spirit's work, but that it is all in the Saviour as Redeemer, many dangerously, fatally de-

96 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

luding cases have been published to the world as remarkable cases of conversion, of salvation, in which, so far as the record goes, there was no salvation at all. Take four typical cases:—

First: "One evening a large number of 'seekers' were kneeling at the altar. All of the workers were busy. I went from one to another, endeavoring to bring them into the light. At last I came to a little newsboy. He was deeply convicted, and cried as though his heart would break. I said, 'Well, my boy, have you asked God to save you?' 'No, sir.' 'Do you not wish to be saved?' 'O, yes, sir.' 'Then why don't you pray?' 'I never prayed; I don't know how.' I hesitated a moment, and then said, 'Tell God just what you want Him to do for you.' The little fellow was silent for a few moments, and then he burst out with intense earnestness: 'O, Lord, help a fellow, won't you?' The answer came quick and clear. In a few moments the tear-stained face was wreathed in smiles. Joy was there instead of sorrow."

Consider this case: There is not one word in the story about a Redeemer, not one word about faith in the Redeemer. A Unitarian, Jew, Universalist, Christian Scientist or infidel could have prayed the same prayer just as earnestly as the boy did, could have had the face wreathed in smiles as the boy had, and still have been at heart a Jew, Unitarian, Universalist, Christian Scientist or infidel. The writer possibly thought that there had been a change of na-

ture, a "change of heart," and he called that conversion, or salvation. This case was published in the most widely-read denominational paper of one of our largest evangelical denominations of the world, without a word of protest and with the tacit endorsement of the editor, and was read by more than a million young people, many of whom concluded that that was the way to be saved, because their paper, their editor, published it for them. It was then copied and tacitly endorsed by the most widely-read denominational paper of another large evangelical denomination, and was again read by more than a million young people, many of whom naturally concluded that that was the way to be saved, because their Sunday School gave it to them, and it was published by their paper, by their denomination. A question: if that is the way to be saved, what was the need of the Saviour dying? of a Redeemer? of faith in a Redeemer? Yet this touching but fatally deluding incident was sent forth by the two most widely-read papers in two great denominations, to be read by millions of young people, confusing them as to God's real and only way of salvation through faith in the *Redeemer*. And they are dealing with the eternal destiny of souls!

The second case: One of the most widely and favorably known Christian workers of modern times in contending for instantaneous conversion, in which contention he was Scriptural, to enforce his contention quoted with approval the following story, in substance:

98 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

A minister wrote that when a young man, not a professing Christian, he was boarding with a Christian man and woman. One evening, the husband being away from home and there being a religious meeting, the lady asked him to accompany her to the meeting. There being only a few present that night, the minister was asking each for a testimony. The young man thought, "He will ask me and what shall I say? I have made up my mind to become a Christian some day; why not begin now?" Just then the minister said, "Brother Charles, have you anything to say?" The young man replied, "I have made up my mind in the last few minutes to begin a Christian life." The minister passed on to others, and then turning said, "Brother Charles, lead us in prayer." The young man said, "Let us pray"; and then the narrator adds, "Somewhere between the time I started to kneel and the time my knees struck the floor, God converted my soul."

Let the reader note that in this account there is not the slightest reference to the Redeemer; not the slightest intimation that faith in the blood of Christ and that alone saves; but solely a sudden, mysterious change. Whatever mysterious, sudden change there may have been, was possibly the Holy Spirit's work; but *there is no saving power in the Holy Spirit's work*; for "this is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptance, that *Christ Jesus* came into the world to save sinners,"—1 Tim. 1:15. Yet this is sent forth to hun-

dreds of thousands of readers as a typical case of sudden conversion! Had the narrator stated that somewhere between his starting to kneel and the time his knees struck the floor, he accepted the Saviour, that he committed his salvation to Him against that day, or that he believed on Him, it would have been a case in point. But as it stands, there is no more of redemption, of salvation through Christ, in the case than in the case of a Mohammedan or a Jew. And the citing of such cases as typical cases of salvation is misleading to inexperienced Christian workers, and utterly confusing to the unsaved man. The cause of this lies in not discriminating between the work of Christ which alone saves, and the work of the Spirit, in which there is no saving efficacy.

Let the third case be taken from "Twice Born Men": "She put her hand on his arm, and he said to her, in a crying tone, 'Oh! I want to be like Joe!'—one of the men who had testified. Afterwards he said to her, 'While I was listening to Joe, thinking of what he's been, and seeing what he's become, all of a sudden it took me that I'd find God and get Him to make me like Joe. It took me like that. I just felt, all of a sudden, *determined* to find God. *Determined!*' he repeated, with energy astonishing in this broken and hopeless creature of alcoholism. 'And,' he went on, 'while I was kneeling, while I was praying, I felt the Spirit of God come upon me. I said, "Oh God, make me like Joe!" and while I prayed, I felt the Spirit

100 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

come upon me, I *knew* I could become like Joe. I know I'm saved.' ”

It is not denied that the Spirit's work was done here, but *that is not salvation*. Let the reader look back and see that there is not one word about Christ dying for our sins; not one word about a Redeemer; not one word about faith in a Redeemer saving; not one word about trusting the Saviour. If such a case is salvation, then what is the use of ever even mentioning the Saviour to a sinner?

The fourth case likewise comes from “Twice Born Men”: “He went to the penitent form, knelt down, and prayed with anguish for forgiveness, and also for strength to make a fresh start. ‘Oh God, oh God,’ he kept saying, ‘I want to be born again!’ He says the answer came with the cry. Then and there he felt his breast broadened, his soul lightened, and the blood coursing joyfully through his veins. He was saved.” If he was, what is the use of the Saviour? Where is there any need of Him? Let the reader look back and see that the Saviour is not mentioned in the entire incident; not only no reference to His dying for our sins (1 Cor. 15:3), and no reference to Him as Redeemer, nor to faith in Him saving, but He is not even mentioned.

Let a fifth case be cited: a prominent evangelist, before a vast audience of men, told the following incident concerning an infidel and his little daughter: “That little girl he loved with an affection that was

beyond the expression of words, but found expression in the everyday life of her father. There was nothing he could do for her that he did not do. One day the little thing sickened; was sick for only a day or two and died. He told me he was sitting in the room adjoining the one in which the little girl lay in her casket, cursing the very day he was born. He said as he sat there he thought if there is any God, 'I defy and curse him, because he has taken away that which I loved best on earth.' He said his little boy came in and lay up against him and said: 'Papa, will you go with me and let me see little sister one more time?' He arose without a word and walked into the adjoining room, and there lay his daughter as if she was in a sweet and gentle sleep. He stood looking into her face, and his little boy looked up at him and said: 'Papa, won't you pray?' He thought, 'What am I to say? Must I say to my only living child, in the presence of my dead child, that I do not pray? Must I set the deadly example for my boy that he did not have a praying father?' He stood for a moment, and then he said: 'I felt my knees give way and I knelt and my little boy knelt by me, and laid his head, sobbing, against my breast.' The mother, an invalid, was confined to her bed. He said: 'I put my arms around him and then I did not know how to pray. I did not know what to say. I remembered the prayer that mother taught me, and I commenced with "Our

102 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

Father who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name; thy kingdom come.” No,’ he said, ‘I cannot say the other—I cannot say it; I cannot say it.’ And then he said, ‘My heart broke, and I said, “Yes, Lord, ‘Thy will be done.’”’ He said: ‘I rose from my knees a saved man. I had then and there surrendered myself to God.’”

Toward the close of an address to over four thousand men, in which he had not shown the way of salvation through the Redeemer, but had stirred the vast audience over the sins of men, the evangelist told the above touching incident, and at the close a large number of men made public profession of conversion. It is a tragically pathetic, heart-touching incident; it is no wonder that strong men broke down and wept over its recital, and it seems almost sacrilegious to criticise it. But let the reader note carefully: that there is not the slightest reference to redemption, to the Saviour, to faith in the blood of Christ. Could not a proud, hard-hearted Jew, Unitarian, Universalist, Christian Scientist, or Mohammedan have been broken down under similar circumstances and been led to say, “Thy will be done”? They could have said, “Our Father, . . . Thy will be done,” for they all, alas! are blinded by the belief that God is their Father (but see John 1:12; 8:41-44; Gal. 3:26; 4:4-7; Eph. 1:5). If a sinner breaking down and saying, “Thy will be done,” is salvation, again the question comes, Why need Christ have died for our sins (1 Cor. 15:2)?

Where is the need of a Redeemer? If this is God's way of salvation, why is it that in not one case of inquirers in the Scriptures were the lost sinners told to kneel down and say "Our Father, . . . Thy will be done," but were invariably pointed to the Redeemer and told to believe on HIM?

And yet in one of the most widely-read family papers in the world the following touching incident was published as a conversion, and was copied and tacitly endorsed by the most widely-read denominational paper in America:—

"In one of the British regiments engaged in the war with the Boers was a big, good-hearted fellow named Bob. The story of his death is one of the belated anecdotes that have found their way tardily into the English papers.

"Bob had an unhappy genius for falling into difficulties. His name appeared often among the records of offences. Officers and men liked him for his good nature and generosity, but no one had influence enough to keep him from the breaches of discipline which constantly marred his life as a soldier. Religion, so far from having any personal meaning for him, was only a matter for a joke. His natural good feelings had never flowered into the manhood that was possible to him.

"One of his chief amusements was poking fun at a fellow private, Tim Akers, a young man of gentle nature and firm religious faith.

“‘Tim,’ he said, one day, ‘I wish you’d lend me that prayer-book o’ yours.’

“‘What’s the joke, Bob?’ asked the young man quietly. He had learned to meet Bob’s clumsy scoffing without quarrelling.

“‘I want to write a letter home to my girl, and I thought I’d find some good words in that book o’ yours.’

“‘Yes, you will find good words in it, and the girl will be glad to get them.’

“Bob burst into a loud laugh. ‘Ho! ho! You’re an easy bite, kid! You don’t really suppose I’d write religion in a love-letter?’

“Tim started to say that religion is love of the purest kind, but the uselessness of it was so plain that he said nothing, and so the matter dropped. The next day a battle was fought. It lasted until night hid the forms of the wounded and the faces of the dead. When the gray dawn broke on the dreadful scene Bob was lying between two dead comrades. A sergeant who lay near him with a shattered foot heard him say in a weak voice, ‘I’ll be away in a few shakes. Is there any religious cove near me?’

“‘Is that you, Bob?’ answered Tim’s weary, boyish voice.

“‘Bad hurt, Tim?’ asked the sergeant.

“‘Yes, I’m done for,’ answered Tim.

“‘Me, too, boy,’ said Bob, thickly. ‘I say, Tim, I didn’t write that letter. I ’adn’t the ’eart, an’ now

I'm done for an' she'll never get it. Can you—can you pray for me, Tim—an' for her? She don't need it, but I do.'

" 'We all need it, Bob,' answered Tim, gently and faintly.

" 'Give us your 'and, Tim. I can just reach you.'

" Tim stretched out his hand and said, 'Now say it after me,' and he repeated the Lord's Prayer.

" Bob said the words after him, clumsily, awkwardly, but with a thrill in his heavy, thick voice. The sergeant joined in.

" 'I—can't—speak—any—more,' whispered the boy. 'Shut your eyes and don't be afraid. We'll go up together. It'll be all right. You'll get in, Bob.'

" 'With all the wrongs I 'ave on me, boy?'

" The breath had left Tim's body. The sergeant glanced at Bob and saw a look of content spread over his face. The dawn was full upon the field. The sergeant had almost forgotten his foot. A drowsy numbness came over him, and when he woke out of it he found himself in the camp hospital.

" He told the story afterward to his comrades. It was long before the tale got beyond the regiment, for soldiers do not tell all the stories they have lived and seen; but every man in the regiment knew of Bob's first and last prayer. A sermon had been preached to them that they did not forget."

Reader, if this be salvation, then where is the need of a Redeemer? Where is the need of a Saviour?

106 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

Where is the need of faith in the Saviour? Where does the New Testament come in as a guide?

Such misleading incidents could be indefinitely multiplied, but these are sufficient to show the confusion existing concerning Redemption and the New Birth, the lack of discrimination between the Saviour as Redeemer and the Holy Spirit as the source of the new spiritual nature.

Not only is the confusion misleading and blinding, but it is far-reaching and fatal in its influence. Because of the publication of such incidents as cases of genuine conversion and their tacit endorsement by leaders of religious thought and work, young or inexperienced or unguarded and indiscriminating Christian workers have been led into not being careful to rightly divide the word of truth (2 Tim. 2:15), and have been misled into doing much spurious, unscriptural work, and into misleading inquirers; and many have been misled into praying for and looking for a mysterious change in the sinner as a thing that would save instead of pointing the sinner to the Saviour as Redeemer from all iniquity (Titus 2:13,14). Contrast such work and such cases as the ones cited above with:—

First, the Saviour with Nicodemus (John 3:1-16). Having taught Nicodemus the necessity of a new spiritual nature, the Saviour tells him the way to be saved, John 3:14-16, "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of

man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish but have everlasting life. For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." Though the Saviour had told him of the necessity of the new spiritual nature, He tells him that the whole of salvation is in believing on Him lifted up, crucified, as Redeemer.

Second, contrast the above and similar cases with Philip and the eunuch (Acts 8:26-40). To the eunuch, the earnest inquirer, Philip did not say, "Tell God just what you want Him to do for you"; he did not tell him to lead in prayer and that somewhere between starting to kneel and his knees striking the floor, he would be converted; he did not tell him to pray and tell God that he wanted to be like some disciple he had seen or heard up at Jerusalem; he did not tell him to pray and tell God that he wanted to be born again; he did not tell him to repeat the Lord's Prayer and when he repeated "Thy will be done," he would be converted. But beginning "at the same Scripture" the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, the passage that the eunuch was reading (he was returning from Jerusalem, where all was excitement over the occurrences of Pentecost, and this Scripture was doubtless one of the Scriptures the disciples were appealing to as to the redemption through Jesus the Saviour), he preached unto him Jesus. That Scripture tells of the Saviour as the sin-bearer, the Re-

108 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

deemer. Here is God's inspired way of leading a lost sinner to be saved, and it is as the poles apart from the cases cited above.

The third case in the Scriptures to contrast with the above cited incidents is that of Peter with Cornelius and his household (Acts 10:1-48). Though Cornelius was a devout, God-fearing man who prayed to God alway and gave much alms to the people, he was yet a lost sinner, for God sent word to him by an angel, "Send to Joppa and call Simon whose surname is Peter; who shall tell thee words whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved,"—Acts 11:13, 14. Here again one has God's inspired plan of showing a lost sinner how to be saved; but there is nothing of having these lost sinners repeat the Lord's Prayer, nor of simply praying to be born again, nor of simply praying to be like some one else, nor of simply praying for help, nor of being mysteriously converted in the act of kneeling; but the record is plain, that Peter said unto them, "To Him give all the prophets witness that through His name whosoever believeth on Him shall receive remission of sins,"—Acts 10:43.

Let the fourth contrast be drawn between the above incidents and the case of Paul and Silas with the Philippian jailer, Acts 16:16-34. If ever an inquirer should have been told to repeat the Lord's Prayer and call that salvation, or to pray for a change and call that salvation, or that he would be converted in the act of kneeling down, here was the time; for the jailer

“came trembling and fell down before Paul and Silas,”—Acts 16:29. But when the convicted, penitent, lost sinner said, “Sirs, what must I do to be saved?”—Acts 16:30, they did not tell him to repeat the Lord’s Prayer, nor to lead in prayer, nor to say “Thy will be done”; but the answer was simple and straightforward, “Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and *thou shalt be saved*,”—Acts 16:31.

There is a vast, vast difference between these cases cited from the Scriptures, and the cases cited above. One set of cases is right, and the other is fatally wrong and fearfully deluding. While the calling of such cases genuine conversions is misleading and injurious to young or inexperienced Christian workers, the effect on lost sinners is utterly bewildering and confusing. The result is that many are depending for salvation upon “a change of heart” instead of upon the Redeemer; whereas, there is *no salvation*, no saving power, in the new birth, the new nature, but only in the Saviour as complete, eternal Redeemer from all iniquity (Heb. 9:12; Titus 2:13, 14).

Concerning salvation being complete and alone through the Redeemer, let the reader consider the testimony of three men:—

Prof. James Denny: “Not only must Atonement by the death of Christ be preached if we would preach the New Testament gospel, but the characteristics of the Atonement must be clearly reflected in the preaching if justice is to be done to the gospel. As

110 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

the finished work of Christ, the Atonement is complete, and the perfection which belongs to it belongs also to the new relation to God into which we enter when the Atonement is appropriated by faith. There is *no* condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus. This relation to God is not determined now in the very least by sin or law, it is determined by Christ the propitiation by faith. The position of the believer is not that of one trembling at the judgment seat, or of one for whom everything remains somehow in a condition of suspense; it is that of one who has the assurance of a divine love which has gone deeper than all his sins, and has taken on itself the responsibility of delivering him from them, . . . Christ died for sins once for all, and the man who believes in Christ and in His death has his relation to God once for all determined not by sin but by the Atonement."

Clow: "The deepest heresy of all, which corrupts churches, leavens creeds with folly, and swells our human hearts with pride, is salvation by works" (salvation by character).

John Ruskin: "I believe that the root of every schism and heresy from which the Christian Church has suffered, has been the effort to earn salvation rather than to receive it; and that one reason why preaching is so ineffective is that it calls on men oft-times to work for God rather than to behold God working for them."

For Further Study:—The teaching of the Scriptures that salvation is instantaneous and complete the moment one believes on the Saviour would be dangerous and a premium on crime but for two invariably attendant facts:—

First, that the one who believes on the Saviour is then and there born again, “being born again not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God,”—1 Peter 1:23; and this new spiritual nature hates sin and inclines to holiness. A vast array of witnesses can be cited, of men and women far down in sin, utterly debased, who, in a moment of time, have received an utter aversion to sin and an intense, undying yearning for holiness.

As an example, a Colorado miner who, from twenty-one years of age to the age of fifty-three, had not drawn a sober breath, staggered into a little church one night far up in the Rocky Mountains and caught one sentence uttered by the preacher, “The blood of Jesus Christ, His Son, cleanseth us from all sin.” Like a drowning man the poor drunkard grasped that promise. Till death in old age he never again touched intoxicating liquors, nor used profanity, nor lived in any other sin. His aversion to sin was pathetic and his yearning after holiness touching. To the author, who knew him well, he stated that the old appetites were as strong as ever, but there was another nature warring against and overcoming the flesh. For years he toiled in the mines by day, and at night, sometimes

112 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

walking miles, he would gather a few miners in some cabin and explain the Scriptures to them and plead with them to depend upon the blood of Christ for redemption. Scores of witnesses are yet living in Lake and Summit counties, Colorado, who will testify to the pious, faithful, godly life of this once moral wreck and afterwards most devout, consecrated, humble miner.

Second, salvation, instantaneous and complete, by believing on Christ as Redeemer, is safeguarded from being dangerous and a premium on crime by, not only a new spiritual nature that prompts to holiness and hatred of sin, but also by a new motive power: "The love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge that if one died for all, then all died; and He died for all, that they who live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto Him who died for them, and rose again,"—2 Cor. 5:14, 15, 1911 Bible; not that the love of Christ *ought* to constrain, but that it *does* constrain; hence, "Every one that hath this hope set on Him, purifieth himself,"—1 John 3:3.

"The love which is the motive of it acts immediately upon the sinful; gratitude exerts an irresistible constraint; His responsibility means our emancipation; His death our life; His bleeding wound our healing. Whosoever says 'He bore our sins,' says substitution; and to say substitution is to say something which involves an immeasurable obligation to

Christ, and has therefore in it an incalculable motive power.”—*Denny*.

That this is not mere theory but a blessed fact can also be testified to by a multitude of witnesses; for example, a friend of the author, who had been a sceptic, blasphemer, scoffer at Christianity and a gambler, who described himself as a “perfect demon for blaspheming,” was led to see that the Scriptures were from God, and to accept the Saviour as his Redeemer from all iniquity through His blood. At once he became a burning and shining light, living above reproach; counting no sacrifice possible too great, if only thereby he could lead some one to accept the redemption through Christ; counting no burden too heavy to bear for Him who had borne all his sins “in His own body on the tree,”—1 Peter 2:24. Hundreds of witnesses are yet living in Denver, Colorado, who will testify to his Christlike life. He was constantly at work trying to lead his former companions and others to be saved; they called him crazy, a crank, a religious fanatic; they nicknamed him “Old Salvation.” Let him tell the cause of this change in his life: writing to lost souls he said: “If you will just accept Him as your personal Saviour, by a simple faith, the seed of a heavenly life will be planted in your soul, and a love will spring up in your bosom not born on earth but at the very throne of Heaven.”——“Almighty God says, ‘For the life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar

114 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

to make atonement for your soul, for it is the blood that maketh atonement for the soul.' God says that it is the precious blood of Christ that maketh atonement for the soul and nothing else will do."——"Oh! what will you do without the Saviour's presence when you come to die? I see your pale and frightened countenance as you lie on a bed of death. I see your anxious looks; friends gaze at you through their tears. Eternity is drawing nigh. In another moment you will be before God. Oh! what will you do unless you are washed from your sins in His precious blood?"

His love and zeal knew no abatement. At last failing health compelled him to give up business, and for three and one-half years he was confined to his room, a great but rejoicing sufferer, still working untiringly for the Saviour, writing hundreds of letters to friends, pleading with them to be saved. From that sick-room he sent forth hundreds of Bibles, Testaments and other religious books and thousands of tracts. He led many sinners, some of them the great sinners of the city, to become Christians in that sick-room, some of them his old life companions and friends, and many were the Christians cheered and comforted and blessed by visits to this dying man of God. An incident of the closing days was that a friend sent him a few dollars to provide comforts for him. He took five dollars of it and bought twelve Testaments and marked them and gave them to friends. In his Bible, after his death, opposite Rev. 14:13 was found written: "There is not

another verse in the Bible where the Holy Spirit breaks in on the word of our dear Master, but here he could not keep still, so he breaks in and says: 'I say so too.' Oh! Christian, look. It occurs when speaking of death. Now, do not fear death, but rejoice when you come to die. Oh! how that verse comforts me in these my last days, and I feel like shouting, for I am soon to see my dear Master."

A few weeks before death he wrote a friend, "I am poorly and failing fast, as I cannot eat anything but broth, and four times last week I nearly fell down from weakness while walking in my room, but glory! I am so much nearer home and truly think that this summer will see me within the palace of the Great King, and the peace and utter fearlessness of death are too wonderful for me to express, as I see myself approach the grave; and the meeting with my dear Heavenly Father (when I can thank Him face to face for His wonderful love and mercy to me, a poor sinner, and thank my dear Saviour for His dying and shedding His precious blood for me) fills me with peace and joy. Death has no terrors for me, but it is a stepping-stone from earth to Heaven." Ten days before his death he became too weak to talk to friends, who daily visited him, and he wrote the following and had it fastened to the head of his bed:—

"God's wonderful love to me in the gift of His dear Son to die for all and the precious blood of

116 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

atonement of my dear Saviour fill me with peace and joy on my death-bed."

(Signed) "GEORGE W. GORE."

He would point visitors to that writing and they understood. On the morning of June 10th, 1902, he said to friends, "I shall leave to-night about 12." To his wife he said, "About 8 P. M. try to sleep a little so that you may be able to come quickly when the nurse calls you." Just before 11 P. M. the summons came. His wife tenderly raised his head and asked, "George, are you dying?" A light of joy filled the dying eyes. He pointed with his finger to the inscription above his pillow, whispering "Good-bye, good-bye," and his spirit was gone, leaving the emaciated body with the finger pointing to his last message on the head of his bed.

Here we have the life and the death of the sceptic, the blasphemer, the scoffer at Christianity, the gambler, who was led to realize that the Scriptures are from God and to accept complete redemption through the Saviour. Can the world furnish an example of one who was once a believer, who became a sceptic, blasphemer and scoffer, who thus wore out his life for others and died with such peace and joy as this? And the motive power of this life was not fear, but love for Him who redeemed him.

But the question arises, May not one who is redeemed and born again, become a backslider? Yes;

but then the Heavenly Father chastises as an earthly father chastises a disobedient child. "Whom the Lord loveth He chasteneth and scourgeth every son whom He receiveth,"—Heb. 12:6. God had promised this before the Saviour came: "Also, I will make him My firstborn, higher than the kings of the earth; My mercy will I keep for him forevermore, and My covenant shall stand fast with him. His seed also will I make to endure forever, and his throne as the days of Heaven. If his children forsake My law and walk not in My judgments; if they break My statutes, and keep not My commandments; then will I visit their transgression with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes. Nevertheless My lovingkindness will I not utterly take from him, nor suffer My faithfulness to fail. My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips,"—Ps. 89:27-34.

Over against the plain teaching of the Scriptures referred to in this chapter that salvation is complete and instantaneous, Acts 2:47, from the Authorized or King James version is often quoted, "And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved," and it is interpreted to mean, not that they were already saved, but that they should be finally saved and were in the process of being saved; and the margin of the Revised Version is quoted as proof of the interpretation, "those that were being saved." But the Revised Version reads "those that were saved," and the passage evidently means that those that were saved

each day were added to the church that day. To make it mean that none were saved, but were being saved, would mean to fly in the face of Eph. 2:8, R.V. and 1911 Bible, "By grace *have ye been saved*," and that all were partly saved and partly lost, partly alive and partly dead, partly under the law, and partly not under the law, partly redeemed and partly not redeemed.

The teaching that saving faith is an instantaneous past act with the believer, not repeated and not continued ("I know whom I *have* believed—I have committed,"—2 Tim. 2:12), may with some need explanation. The act of faith by which a woman accepts a man as her husband, the moment they are pronounced husband and wife by the properly authorized official, is a completed, past act, not continued. But, as her husband, she repeatedly, continuously, trusts him to love her, to care for her, to protect her, etc. That faith is repeated, continuous. So, the moment one accepts, believes on the Saviour, he is saved (Eph. 2:8; John 5:24), and the saving faith is then a completed, past act, not repeated, not continued; but there is subsequently the repeated, continued faith of trusting the Heavenly Father to guide, protect, provide for, etc.

Prof. Wm. James, the learned Harvard University Professor, in "The Varieties of Religious Experience," said, "Every religious phenomenon has its theory and its derivation from natural antecedents." By this he ruled out the miraculous in the new birth. Let those

who think with Prof. James explain the case of George W. Gore, given in this chapter, from "natural antecedents." The effort will be as pitiable as the effort of Prof. James to evade the force of George Muhler's answers to prayer.

Before one can be thus instantaneously, completely saved by believing on Christ, he must repent, for the Saviour said, "Repent ye and believe the Gospel,"—Mark 1:15; and the Saviour said that one must repent before he can believe on the Saviour: "and ye, when ye had seen it, repented not afterward that ye might believe Him,"—Matt. 21:32. (For a more extended treatment of repentance see the Author's "God's Plan with Men," Chapter VII.)

V

THE NEW BIRTH

IF language can be made to mean anything definite, the Scriptures teach an actual, literal new birth, and not a change of the original nature; not a moral reformation of the old nature. Were one, skilled in the use of language, to try to make clear the new birth as a literal fact, he could not use plainer, stronger language than is used in the Scriptures: "As many as received Him to them gave He power to become the children of God, even to them that believe on His name: who *were born*, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God,"—John 1:12, 13; "Except a man be *born again*, he cannot see the Kingdom of God,"—John 3:3; "That which is *born* of the flesh is flesh, and that which is *born* of the Spirit is spirit,"—John 3:6; "Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be *born again*,"—John 3:7; "Whosoever is *born* of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him, and he cannot sin, because he is *born* of God,"—John 3:9; "Beloved, let us love one another: for love is of God; and every one that loveth is *born* of God, and knoweth God,"—1 John 4:7; "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is *born* of God; and every one that loveth him that *begat*

loveth him also that is *begotten* of him,"—1 John 5:1; "Whosoever is *born* of God overcometh the world,"—1 John 5:4; "We know that whosoever is born of God sinneth not; but he that is *begotten* of God keepeth himself and the evil one toucheth him not,"—1 John 5:18; "Of His own will brought *He us forth* by the word of truth,"—James 1:18, R.V.; "Being *born again*, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God,"—1 Peter 1:23.

While the new birth is "of God" it is always, invariably, "*by the word of God*,"—1 Peter 1:23; "Of His own will brought *He us forth* [the birth] *by the word of truth*,"—James 1:18, R.V.; "God hath from the beginning *chosen you to salvation* through sanctification of the Spirit and *belief of the truth*,"—2 Thess. 2:13. On this point two of America's great theologians are explicit, as is also a noted theologian of Europe:—

"ONLY as the sinner's mind is brought in contact *with the truth*, does God complete the regenerating work."—A. H. Strong, President Rochester Theological Seminary.

"The Scriptural teaching is that God operates *immediately* upon the heart to produce the required change by which it is fitted to receive the truth and *mediately* through the word and other agencies *in its reception of that truth*."—J. P. Boyce, in "Abstract of Systematic Theology," when President Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

122 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

“In the first stage God works *WITHOUT MEANS*; in the second stage, that of conversion, He *employs means*, viz., *the preaching of the word*.”—Abraham Kuyper, Professor Systematic Theology, University of Amsterdam, in “The Work of the Holy Spirit.”

The teaching of these three great theologians being clearly the teaching of the Scriptures, that men are only born again by the *word of God* (1 Peter 1:23); that they are *brought forth* (born) *by the word of truth* (James 1:18, R.V.); that they are chosen *to salvation* only through sanctification of the Spirit and *belief of the truth* (2 Thess. 2:13); then the conclusion is inevitable, absolute, that *no one*, however pious, devout, God-fearing, is *born again* who has not *believed the truth*. How all-important, then, the question: What truth? Evidently not *all* truth, but *the* truth; not the truths of astronomy, of geology, of botany; not the truth as to Moses being the author of the Pentateuch; not the truth as to the authorship of Daniel; not the truth as to one Isaiah or many. A man may be in error as to all of these truths and yet be a saved man, really born again; but *the truth as to salvation*. Hear the apostle: “I am not ashamed of the Gospel; for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth,”—Rom. 1:16; not every gospel, not all good tidings; but the definite gospel, *THE* gospel. Let the apostle define clearly: “I declare unto you *the gospel* which I preached unto you . . . by which also ye are

saved . . . for I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received; *how that Christ died for our sins* according to the Scriptures; and that He was buried, and that He rose again the third day according to the Scriptures,"—1 Cor. 15:1-3. But for *how many* of our sins did He die, did He give Himself (Gal. 1:4)? Let the apostle answer: "Our Saviour Jesus Christ who gave Himself for us that He might redeem us from *all iniquity*,—Titus 2:13, 14. Note well the conclusion: this being the truth that saves, *no one is saved, no one is born again, who has not believed this truth*; for we are born again by the word of God (1 Peter 1:23); we are brought forth (born) by the word of truth (James 1:18, R.V.); we are chosen to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth (2 Thess. 2:13).

This fact, and fact it is, is alarming; for there are many, many devout, pious men and women, many such that are highly intellectual, prominent in religious work, *who do not believe the truth*, that Christ died for our sins, that He was buried, that He rose again (1 Cor. 15:3); that He gave Himself for us that He might redeem us from all iniquity (Titus 2:13, 14). They are depending partly upon the church, or baptism, or their good lives, past or future, to save or help save. Not one of them is saved, is born again. The apostle's prayer for Israel applies to them: "Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is that they might be saved. For I bear them record that

they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge. For they being ignorant of God's righteousness and *going about to establish their own righteousness*, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God. For Christ is the *end of the law* for righteousness to every one that believeth,"—Rom. 10:1-4.

It is no pleasure to write thus. Any one with the least of human sympathy and love for humanity would far prefer to write of the "larger hope" and to take what some term "the broader view." But, to adopt the words of another, "To employ soft words and honeyed phrase in discussing questions of everlasting importance; to deal with errors that strike at the foundation of all human life as if they were harmless and venial mistakes; to bless where God disapproves, and to make apologies where He calls us to stand up like men and assert, though it may be the aptest method of securing popular applause in a sophistical age, is cruelty to man and treachery to Heaven. Those who on such subjects attach more importance to the rules of courtesy than they do to the measures of truth do not defend the citadel, but betray it into the hands of its enemies. Charity for the persons of men, whatever their opinions, is a Christian virtue, but I have yet to learn that the opinions themselves fall under its scope. On the contrary, I apprehend that love for Christ and for the souls for whom He died, will be the exact measure of our zeal in exposing the dangers by which men's

souls are ensnared.”—Thornwell, quoted by Bishop, in “The Doctrines of Grace.”

Consider some cases in which, so far as the record goes, there was no belief of the truth,” no accepting the Saviour as Redeemer:—

The first is from “Souls in Action,” by Harold Begbie: A mission worker in the West London Mission handed a fallen girl a white flower on the street one night. Some months afterward in response to a ring of the doorbell the mission worker opened her door and invited a girl standing there to come in. Stepping in “the girl said, ‘I don’t suppose you remember me, but you once gave me a flower in Piccadilly, and I told you it was six years since a respectable woman had spoken to me. You asked me if you could do anything for me, and I said, “No.” You said that perhaps you could, and invited me to come and see you. I have come now. I want you to help me. The flower you gave me has brought me here. It wouldn’t let me rest.’ Then, her poor broken heart soothed by the love and tenderness of the Sister, she told the story of her new birth; and for beauty and simplicity this story is matchless in all I have read or heard of conversion.” If a complete change of life caused by the contrast between a white flower and the life of a polluted, sinful woman, causing her to turn to a life of purity, be the “new birth,” what is the need of a Saviour dying for our sins?

126 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

Another case from "Souls in Action": "Tenderly received and encouraged by this missionary, the young man then and there, to use his own words, 'gave himself to God,' a phrase which means a deep, utter, and most earnest submission of the human will to that sense of the Divine will, that sense of the highest and the best, that sense of pursuing love and overshadowing protection which exists in the soul of all who have ever prayed. 'Since that night,' he says, 'my life has been one long joy and gladness.'"

Let the reader note that in this case, as recorded, there is not the slightest reference to the Saviour, to redemption, nor to faith in the Saviour saving us. Could not a Jew, Mohammedan, Christian Scientist, Unitarian, or Universalist "give himself to God"? If this be the new birth, if this be salvation, where is the need of a Redeemer?

A case from "Twice Born Men," by Harold Begbie:—"Such was the Puncher's faith in conversion; such to him was the reality of the new birth, and this is really what happened to Danny. Danny came to the Salvation Army meeting; he felt a light of illumination break through his soul at the adjutant's assurance of God's *love* for the worst of men; he realized all of a sudden the need for love in his own barren heart, and in that spirit, the spirit of a broken and contrite heart, he knelt at the penitent form, and for the first time really reached into the infinite. He prayed for mercy; he prayed for strength. He rose

from his knees a changed man." Again, there is not one word about the necessity of redemption; not one word about Christ dying for our sins; not one word about faith in the Redeemer.

Another case from Mr. Begbie:—in his "Other Sheep" he gives the case of a demon-possessed woman in India: "Not very far from her own dwelling was a little village where the Salvation Army had set up its banner of Liberation. She had heard of Christ as 'One to whom people prayed in trouble.' She had no further knowledge of Christianity, and was entirely unacquainted with the story of Christ's life. He was to her 'one of the Gods.' It occurred to her, in a mood of utter dejection, that she should make trial of this new God. She said nothing to her family, but set out one day for the village occupied by the Salvationists. When she arrived she found a meeting in progress. She entered the hall, and advanced to the platform. One who was present tells me that the poor miserable woman appeared to be dazed and unconscious, like a sleep-walker, that when she reached the platform she suddenly uttered a scream which was perfectly 'soul-thrilling,' fell down upon her knees, and, seizing the feet of one of the Salvationists, held them as in a vice and remained in that posture, shaken by a violent convulsion, for fifteen minutes. She was praying, but she does not remember what entreaty left her soul, or what happened to her. No one had spoken. Nothing had been preached

128 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

to touch her heart. No hymn had been sung to open a door for her into the way of peace. But she felt conscious of restoration, of something that gave her freedom, above all things of a new and delicious independence of her demon. The mere prostration before this God who was kind to people in trouble brought her a sense of relief. 'I was never afraid after that,' she declares. 'The demon used to come to me, but he did not speak.' Christianity, be it remembered, was at this time as foreign to her understanding as the literature of Greece or the text-books of physical science. Some few weeks after this occurrence, she was one day gathering wood in the jungle, when she felt herself moved by some unseen power to kneel down then and there, and beseech Christ to rid her once and forever of that devil's presence. 'I did not know that Christ had ever cast out devils,' she says, 'all I knew at that time was His name, and that people in trouble prayed to Him; nothing more.' Surrendering herself to this inexplicable and sudden inclination the poor gatherer of sticks kneeled down in the solitude of the jungle, and prayed solemnly, calmly and articulately to Christ for succor and complete liberation from the menace of evil. On the instant, she says, the haunting spirit left her. Amazement was followed by joy and joy thrilled and swelled in her breast, till it became a glorious gratitude and a passionate adoration. . . . It was with wonder unspeakable that she learned the earth-story of Christ from

the Salvationists to whom she carried in a joyous gratitude the news of her deliverance. She was spell-bound by the simple beauty and poignant tragedy of that story. Converted already, for nothing will shake her from the certainty that she gave her soul to Christ alone in the jungle, she became a Christian." If by "converted already" Mr. Begbie means the new birth, then this new birth was independent of faith in Christ as Redeemer, but the Scriptures teach plainly that we are born again *by the word of God* (1 Peter 1:23).

A similar case of what is published as salvation without faith in Christ as Redeemer, is given by a prominent minister of London, England: "'Yes, Christ can save you. He is after you now. Get down here and pray.' He said, 'I don't know how to pray.' I said, 'Tell Him you don't know how to pray.' 'I don't know how to tell Him.' 'Tell Him you don't know how to tell Him.' He got down on his knees and said, 'God, I don't know how to pray; I am a poor sinner,' and then as I knelt there by his side I felt his arm go around me, and he pulled me to him, and we finally broke out in praise to God together. Saved, saved on the spot."

So far as the record goes (and why was the record made if not as a guide, for instruction?), in none of these cases cited, was there the showing the way of salvation through Christ as Redeemer; and therefore not one of them was born again; for we are born

again *by the word of God*" (1 Peter 1:23); we are brought forth (born) *by the word of truth* (James 1:18, R.V.). It is not a question alone of piety, of devoutness, nor of an inner change, but of *redemption*, of belief of the truth (2 Thess. 2:13), of being *brought forth* (born) by the word of truth (James 1:18, R.V.); and if these people have not believed the truth, they have not been brought forth (born). For these cases and all similar cases, there may be found some explanation, but *they are not cases of the new birth*. Such cases will be considered in the next chapter.

To avoid the unwelcome conclusion, that no one is born again who has not by faith received the Saviour as complete Redeemer, some have imagined that there is such a thing as "unconscious faith." Even so clear a writer as W. M. Clow, of Glasgow, who is true to the Scriptures, and stands for real redemption through the blood of Christ, in his splendid work, "The Cross in Christian Experience," says, "There is an unconscious faith." It is time that men who believe in real redemption were done with trying to make a blanket to cover those who reject real redemption, and to make a blanket with the unsubstantial plea of "unconscious faith" wide enough to cover those who reject real redemption. Those they are trying to shield by this fanciful invention, who have rejected Christ as Saviour, as Redeemer, may have been sanctified, or begotten, by the Spirit, in which case, though they are

lost now, they will eventually be led to accept Christ as Redeemer, and be born again; but until they repent and believe on Christ, accept Him and rely on Him alone as Saviour, Redeemer, *they are lost sinners*. "Unconscious faith" is a non-healing, insidiously poisoning salve, composed of one-half sentiment, one-fourth imagination and one-fourth groundless hope, placed by a tender-hearted, unscientific, unguarded physician upon the cancer of an unredeemed, unregenerated soul to hide from view the plague-spot which a proud sinner is unwilling to take to the Great Physician for real healing.

If there is an "unconscious faith" that saves, why preach to men to have a conscious faith? Why preach, "Repent ye, and believe the Gospel"?—Mark 1:15. If one man has unconscious faith, why may it not be that all have it? If one may have "unconscious faith" and be an unconscious Christian, why may not one have "unconscious faith" in Mohammed or Confucius, and we all turn up at the judgment day unconscious heathen?

For Further Study:—The question may arise in the minds of some, If we are saved through faith in Christ as Redeemer, where is the need of the new birth? Let it be kept in mind that redemption through Christ has to do with the just penalty for sin, that Christ's dying for our sins (1 Cor. 15:3) is redemption from the curse of the law,—“Christ hath redeemed us from

132 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

the curse of the law,"—Gal. 3:13; and that this does not give a new spiritual nature, which comes from the Holy Spirit (John 3:7, 8). If, now, one were saved through the redemption of Christ and there were no attendant new birth, there would still be the old nature simply, and no hatred of sin, nor inclination to holiness; "Because the fleshly mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can it be,"—Rom. 8:7, 1911 Bible.

In the second place, a person thus saved, without a new nature, without a new birth, would be miserable in Heaven. "A profligate in the house of prayer, a giddy worldling standing by a death-bed, a drunkard in the company of holy men, feel instinctively that they are misplaced—they have no enjoyment there. And what enjoyment could unregenerate men have in God's kingdom on earth or in Heaven? Even the outward service of the sanctuary below is distasteful to them in proportion to its spirituality." The writer quoted need not have limited it to the "profligate in the house of prayer," but could have extended it to the most refined woman. Take the purest woman on earth to Heaven without being born again, and she would be miserable. She cannot enjoy a really spiritual prayer-meeting, much less Heaven. Without the new birth here she prefers the card-table or the ballroom or the theatre to the prayer-meeting, and would be miserable if denied these and placed in the prayer-meeting.

Let those who think that pious, devout people who do not believe the truth are really born again, really saved, answer these questions: If men can get the benefit of Christ dying without consciously accepting by faith the redemption through Christ, what is the use of preaching the gospel at all? If the benefits of Christ's redemption can be applied to one without consciously by faith accepting, depending on it, then it could thus be applied at all; where, then, is the need of faith in the Redeemer?

If we are born again by the word of God (1 Peter 1:23), then there is, in our day, something that is "the word of God," or there is in our day no new birth. If we are brought forth (born) by the word of truth (James 1:18, R.V.), then there is, in our day and time, something that is "the word of truth" or there is in our day and time no new birth. If God has chosen us to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth (2 Thess. 2:13), then there is, in our day and time, something that is "the truth" or none in our day and time are saved. Those who hold, then, that the Scriptures are not inspired so that they are "the word of God," "the word of truth," "the truth," as a matter of fact do not believe in a real new birth, as there is, to them, no infallible truth by which alone we are born again.

While the Scriptures teach clearly that we are born again "by the word of God," "by the word of truth," by "belief of the truth," and that only such are really

134 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

born again, there are, beyond all doubt, many pious, devout, God-fearing men and women whose lives give evidence of a new spiritual nature, of a hatred of sin and inclination to holiness, who have not *believed the truth*, for they are depending on the church, or baptism, or their good lives, past or future, to save them, or to help them. One such, a most devout, God-fearing man, made the statement that he did not dare wait till night to confess his sins to God,—that he might be lost! This statement may have been the unguarded statement of a really saved man, one really born again; but if it was his real heart's testimony, then he surely had not believed the truth that Christ died for our sins (1 Cor. 15:3); that He gave Himself for us that He might redeem us from all iniquity (Titus 2:13, 14); that by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified (Heb. 10:14).

The lives of many who have never believed the truth give convincing evidence of a new spiritual nature. To the consideration of such cases the next chapter will be given.

VI

BEGETTING BEFORE BIRTH

“IN every birth there is a *germ infused*, and so in this one. It is this implanting in us of a supernatural, permanent, fixed principle—something that never was in us before and never again will be absent.”—*Bishop, in “The Doctrines of Grace.”* Had this usually clear writer said, “*Before* every birth there is a germ infused and so in this one,” he would have been scientifically exact, strictly in line with *fact*; for every thing that is born is begotten previous to being born.

In this distinction is the explanation of many of the confusing cases often cited by religious writers, in which, according to their records, the persons had not believed the truth, and yet there had been some manifest spiritual change. If we are *brought forth* (born) *by the word of truth* (James 1:18, R.V.), then that which is brought forth was previously begotten of the Spirit; if we are born again (brought forth) *by the word of God* (1 Peter 1:23), we were previously to that begotten of the Spirit. The being brought forth by the word of truth in James 1:18, R.V., and the being born again by the word of God in 1 Peter 1:23, correspond to “belief of the truth” in 2 Thess. 2:13. But back of “belief of the truth” is “through sancti-

136 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

cation [setting apart] of the Spirit" in 2 Thess. 2:13, the begetting of the Spirit of that which is "brought forth by the word of truth," of that which is "born again by the word of God." This distinction is made clear in John 1:12, 13, R.V., "As many as received Him, to them gave He the right to become the children of God, even to them that believe on His name: who were born [Greek, begotten], not of blood nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God,"—"which *were* born" (Greek, begotten); hence this begetting was previous to receiving Him, believing on His name; for not only does the apostle say that they *were* begotten (previously), but he says, "not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, *nor of the will of man*"; but the new *birth*, the being born again, is "of the will of man," for it is "by the word of God" (1 Peter 1:23), by "belief of the truth" (2 Thess. 2:13), and belief is "*of the will of man*."

Now, how long, in every case, one is begotten of the Spirit before he is born again by the word of God (1 Peter 1:23), brought forth (born) by the word of truth (James 1:18, R.V.), by belief of the truth (2 Thess. 2:13), God's word does not reveal. But in one case, at least, God has revealed when the work of the Spirit took place; for concerning John the Baptist it was promised, "He shall be filled with the Holy Spirit even from his mother's womb,"—Luke 1:13, 1911 Bible. John the Baptist was not saved by this; for no one is saved except through

conscious faith (there is no other kind) in blood; "apart from shedding of blood there is no remission,"—Heb. 9:22, R.V., and "propitiation through faith in His Blood,"—Rom. 3:25.

Apparently the case of Cornelius is another where there is considerable time between the "sanctification of the Spirit" (or begetting of the Spirit) and the being born again by the word of God, or the being brought forth by the word of truth; for he was "a devout man and one that feared God with all his house, who gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God alway,"—Acts 10:2. Evidently there is a nature not at "enmity against God,"—Rom. 8:7; one that hates sin and fears God. Yet he is unsaved, not born again, for God, through an angel, tells him to send for Peter, "who shall *tell these words*, whereby thou and all thy house shalt be saved,"—Acts 11:14; and Peter tells him, "To Him give all the prophets witness that through His name whosoever believeth on Him shall receive remission of sins,"—Acts 10:43. It is by this that he is saved, and as a result is "born again," "not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, *by the word of God*,"—1 Peter 1:23.

In the natural world somewhere back of every birth there must have been a begetting of that which is afterward brought forth (James 1:18, R.V.). Likewise, somewhere back of the spiritual birth there must always be the begetting. The begetting (or sanctification) is of the Spirit; the being brought

forth (the being born) is "*by the word of truth*,"—James 1:18, R.V., the being born again is "*by the word of God*,"—1 Peter 1:23. That the Scriptures teach the two separate works in the new birth is the testimony of the three great theologians already quoted:—

J. P. Boyce, in "Abstract of Systematic Theology": "The Scripture teaching is that God operates *immediately* (without means) upon the heart to produce the required change, by which it is fitted to receive the truth, and *mediately* through the word and other agencies in its reception of the truth."

Abraham Kuyper, in "The Work of the Holy Spirit": "The first *conscious* and comparatively co-operative act of man is always *preceded* by the original act of God, planting in him the first principle of a new life, under which act man is wholly *passive* and unconscious."

Kuyper: "The implanting of the new life *precedes* the first act of faith, but conversion *follows* it."

Kuyper: "In the first stage God works *without means*; in the second stage, that of conversion, He *employs means*, viz., the preaching of the word."

Kuyper: "This divine act is wrought in man at different ages; when, no one can tell. We know from the instance of John the Baptist that it can be wrought even in the mother's womb. And the salvation of deceased infants constrains us, with Voetius and all profound theologians, to believe that this original

act may occur very early in life." "They have no conscious faith." There is no other kind of faith.

A. H. Strong, in "Systematic Theology": "Only as the sinner's mind is brought into contact with the truth, does God complete the regenerating work." The work was begun previously (begetting) and is *completed* by "belief of the truth,"—2 Thess. 2:13.

Another noted American scholar and theologian is equally clear and to the point as to this distinction. Alva Hovey, in "Manual of Theology and Ethics," says: "The Scriptures represent truth as only a means, or instrument, but the Spirit as a *generator* or source of the new life. . . . The principle of life, the new disposition, is given by the Holy Spirit."

The question now arises, what is accomplished in each case by these two separate works?

The begetting or sanctification (setting apart) of the Spirit gives an actual new spiritual nature; the being brought forth (born) by the word of truth (James 1:18, R.V.), or being born again by the word of God (1 Peter 1:23), gives conscious spiritual life, and new motive power. Let us consider the two:

The begetting or sanctification (setting apart) of the Spirit giving an actual new spiritual nature is no exception, but is in line with God's plan throughout nature. *The begetting, and not the birth, determines nature.* The nature is determined always before birth. Birth does not change nature, but is the bringing forth of a nature previously existing. On this

point consider the words of Kuyper, the Amsterdam theologian: "God comes to one born in iniquity and dead in trespasses and sins and plants the principle (nature) of a new spiritual life in his soul."—"Persons who received the life-principle early in life are no more dead but live."—"In early life they often manifest holy inclinations sometimes truly marvellous," though "they have no conscious faith." If, as in the case of John the Baptist and cases referred to by Kuyper, there are often manifestations of holy inclinations sometimes truly marvellous, often much more marvellous are these manifestations in the lives of grown and sometimes hardened sinners.

That is the result of the begetting, sanctifying, setting apart, consecrating, purifying of the Spirit. But this is not salvation. *Salvation comes only through Redemption.* Many of these who thus manifest holy inclinations, sometimes truly marvellous, *have never believed the truth; hence, they are not born again by the word of God* (1 Peter 1.23). Let us consider some cases in point:—

The first is taken from a booklet published by a Christian worker, giving the account of a case in his own work:

"She had been reared in an earnest Christian home, by pious, godly parents, and when Providence first brought our lives together, she had for years been a consistent, active church member, the leader of the young people's work, active in the ladies' society and

teacher of a large class in the Sunday-school; welcomed everywhere in society, yet always maintaining the highest standard of religious character and deportment and the respect and reverence of all with whom she came in contact, for her Christian profession.

"My first fear that she was mistaken as to her salvation was aroused by her asking me, 'Mr. Blank, do you think that only real Christians desire to see other people saved?'

"I was at once impressed that she was troubled concerning her own salvation, and let her know that I was so impressed. She at once changed the subject of conversation, and I saw that she was either pained or offended at my suggestion.

"Some days after this she said to me, 'Mr. Blank, I wish you would suggest some Scriptures on assurance for me to read.'

"I was impressed that it was the time to speak plainly, and I replied, 'Miss R——, I don't think you need any Scriptures on assurance; I think you need to lose what assurance you already have, for I fear you have made a mistake, and that you are not saved, that you are not really a Christian.'

"I saw that the delicate refined nature was stung by my abrupt reply, and so the subject of conversation was immediately changed.

"It was several days after that she came to me and said, 'I very much fear that you are correct in re-

gard to my condition. I have never told any one, but ever since I united with the church I have been troubled. I have never been at rest. There has always been a hollowness in my religious life. I have tried to do my duty, but there has been no peace in my life. All the sermons on the way of salvation that I have ever heard have been cloudy and confused to me. I yearn for peace, and to realize that I am surely going to Heaven.'

"After some moments I said, 'Miss R——, tell me about what you thought was your conversion when you joined the church.'

"She replied, 'Well, a noted evangelist was conducting a meeting here. Many were deeply interested. I felt no special concern, but as many of my friends were seeking salvation, and I always did want to be saved, I went with them night after night to the front seats to be prayed for. One night at the close of the meeting, the evangelist said, "Here is a large river. On each side of it there is a city. In one city they are having dancing and theatres and card-playing and all forms of pleasures, but there are no Christians there, and none of them are going to Heaven. In the other city they are having none of these pleasures, but churches, prayer-meetings and many hardships. But all in this city are going to Heaven. Now, all of you who would rather live in this last city are converted, and you ought to join the church." Of course I preferred to live in the second city and go to Heaven

than to live in the first and go to Hell, and so I went forward and united with the church.'

"I asked, 'Miss R——, is that all the conversion you have had?'

"She replied, 'Yes, sir; I thought that I must be converted, as the preacher said that all who felt that way were converted. I didn't know, and so I depended on what he said.'

"'Well,' said I, 'let's see what God's word says about it. Jesus in talking with Nicodemus said,—John 3:14, 15, "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have eternal life." Here you see that it is not how you feel, or where or how you prefer to live, but your believing in the Lord Jesus, trusting your salvation completely to Him, that saves you; and that makes it sure, for God says that if you believe in Him you shall not perish but have eternal life.'

"'But,' said she, 'what about my being born again?'

"I replied, 'That is not your work, and with that you have nothing to do, for it is the Holy Spirit's work, and He never fails to do His work. Here is what the Saviour said about it, John 3:8, "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth, so is every one that is born of the Spirit."'

“ ‘How may I know, then,’ she inquired, ‘when I am born again?’ ”

“ ‘Let God answer that question, 1 John 5:1, “Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God.” ’ ”

“ ‘But,’ she inquired further, ‘what about my repenting?’ ”

“ ‘One must repent before he can believe, for Jesus said, Mark 1:15, “Repent ye, and believe the gospel”; and again, Matt. 21:32, “And ye, when ye had seen it, repented not afterwards, that ye might believe Him.” But notice, it is the act of repentance and not the word repentance that God requires. And much that is called repentance is not real repentance. It is true that God says, Is. 55:7, “Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts,” but God also says, Heb. 6:1, “Repentance from dead works,” and in Heb. 9:13, 14, we see that dead works are the works that men do in order to be saved. So that persons have not really repented until they have not only turned from their way and thoughts, but also from their trying to do any works in order to be saved. To get what our Saviour meant by repentance, let’s go back. He said, “As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness even so”—that the occurrence back there illustrated the way we are saved. The people bitten by the serpents realized that they had sinned against God, that they deserved punishment, were justly condemned, that they were helpless, and in their

helplessness they turned to God for relief. That is repentance; and then God provided the easiest, simplest, surest way possible, Num. 21:8, "Make thee a fiery serpent, and set it upon a pole; and it shall come to pass that every one that is bitten, when he looketh upon it, shall live." How easy, simple, sure. One look and God's promise was that he "shall live." Now Jesus says, "Even so must the Son of Man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have eternal life." If the bitten Israelite looked, and did not live, it was because God failed to keep His promise; even so, if you believe in the Lord Jesus, trust Him to save you, and then do not go to Heaven, it will be because the Lord Jesus fails to keep His promise. Now take the case of the jailer at Philippi, Acts 16:19-34. The jailer asked Paul and Silas, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved? And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." They did not tell him to get himself born again; that was the Holy Spirit's work and He would attend to that. Neither did they tell him to repent; yet the repentance must come before we can trust the Saviour to save us. But notice, the jailer had repented. He had realized that he had sinned against God, that he deserved punishment, that he was helpless, and now he turns in his helplessness to God for relief. And their answer was simple, and plain, and positive. "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and THOU SHALT BE SAVED."

“‘But I fear I do not really understand,’ she replied, ‘what believe on the Lord Jesus Christ means. I know I shall be saved if I do it, for God says so, but what does God mean by “Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ”?’”

“‘We are told,’ I answered, ‘that the Saviour came to seek and to save that which was lost,’ Luke 19:10. Notice, not to help save, but to save, to do all the work of saving Himself. If, then, He is to do the saving, all of it, what we have to do is to leave it entirely to Him, to trust the whole of our salvation to Him. Here is what God says about it, Rom. 4:5, “To him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness.” He says that Christ will justify the ungodly; hence, it is not a question of your getting good enough to be saved, or to go to Heaven. If you were a million times greater sinner than you are, He would save you as willingly and as surely as if you were the best woman in the world, for He justifies *the ungodly*. And then He *justifies them*. You remember that Jesus said, “Even so must the Son of Man be lifted up.” It was the only way we could be justified. Hence, God tells us, Is. 53:6, “All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one his own way; and the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all.” And again, Titus 2:14, “Who gave Himself for us that He might redeem us from all iniquity.” Hence, we are told that we are justified

by His blood, Rom. 5:9. Now then God says, "To him that worketh not, but believeth on Him." Here is the work of our being saved, to be done by some one. The Saviour came to save, not to help save. He says for you not to try to do the work, not to try to help do it, but to believe on Him, leave the entire work of your being saved to Him, trust Him to save you. Now the question comes, Will you do it? Have you confidence enough in Jesus to trust your being saved entirely to Him, to go into eternity resting solely on Him for your salvation?'

"After a few moments' thought, she answered, 'But what if I should not live hereafter just as He wishes me to live?'

"'You may lose your reward by not living as you should, but not your salvation. God's word makes a clear distinction between your salvation and your reward. The Saviour said, John 10:28, "I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish"; but he also said in Matt. 6:20, "Lay up for yourselves treasures in Heaven." Paul adds, 1 Cor. 3:8, "And every man shall receive his own reward according to his own labor." And Jesus adds further, Rev. 22:12, "And, behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with Me, to give every man according as his work shall be." Your salvation depends upon what your Saviour did for you, and you accept, but your reward depends upon what you do for your Saviour, and He accepts. Now what depends on you you can lose,

your reward; but what depends upon Christ you cannot lose, your salvation. Hence, Paul says, 1 Cor. 3:15, "If any man's works shall be burned, he shall suffer loss, but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire."

"But again, if you do not live as you should, God will chasten you as a father whips his child, Heb. 12:5-8, "My son, despise not thou the chastening of the Lord, nor faint when thou art rebuked of Him; for whom the Lord loveth He chasteneth and scourgeth every son whom He receiveth." A disobedient Christian will be chastened, chastened severely, scourged, but not sent to Hell, for the Lord Jesus promised, John 6:37, "Him that cometh unto Me I will in no wise cast out."

"But," came the objection, "it looks as if people would become careless, if they are certain not to be lost."

"If they do, God is certain to chasten them. But you forget, Miss R——, the great motive-power in the real Christian's life. The night before the Saviour was crucified He held up a cup of wine and said, Matt. 26:28, "This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." His blood, then, settles for our sins; as Paul says, Eph. 1:7, "In whom we have redemption through His blood." Our Lord then said, John 14:15, "If ye love Me, keep My commandments," not "if ye are afraid of Hell," nor "if ye desire to

go to Heaven," for both of these questions were settled by His blood ; but " if ye love Me." "

" " Oh, I see! He suffered and died for my sins, and if I accept Him as my Saviour and trust Him to save me, that saves me, and then I serve Him the rest of my life because I love Him for suffering and dying for me and saving me, and not because I am afraid of being lost.'

" ' Exactly,' I replied. ' Now then, if the Saviour were here in bodily presence, you would at once accept Him as your Saviour and trust your being saved entirely to Him, and you know He would keep His promise and save you. Well, He knows your heart, and the very moment you believe on Him, trust your salvation to Him, He knows it, and it is settled forever. Will you here and now, just as if He were here, accept Him as your Saviour and trust your salvation entirely to Him forever, to go into eternity on His sacred promise, " Him that cometh unto Me, I will in no wise cast out " ?' "

" " Yes, sir, I will.'

" " Thank God! Now, Miss R——, one step more. If to-night God should send an angel to you, and you should be convinced that it was no delusion, but a real messenger from Heaven, and He should deliver a written message to you from the Lord Jesus, which should read as follows: " To R——: I, the Son of Man, send you this to tell you that you have a home in Heaven, and when your life on earth is finished

you will surely be with me in Heaven," would it not bring joy and peace to you?'

" 'Indeed it would.'

" 'And ever afterwards when tempted to think that you might not be saved after all, would you depend on the way you felt about it, or on His message to you?'

" 'Oh, His message to me would be all I would need; I could rest on that and be satisfied.'

" 'Now are you sure that you have accepted Him as your Saviour and have trusted your salvation to Him?'

" 'Yes, sir.'

" 'Then please read this.'

" The message was John 6:47, ' Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on Me, hath everlasting life.'

" 'Is not that just as good as if it were a message sent from Heaven to you? for it is the message of the Lord Jesus to you, and it says you already have everlasting life.'

" I shall never forget the expression of quiet peace and joy that came over her face; it is on her face in Heaven to-day."

Here is a case where the holy inclinations were so manifest, the life so devout, that doubtless not one person who knew her doubted her being a saved woman; yet from her own clear testimony *she had not believed the truth* (2 Thess. 2:13); then *she had*

not been brought forth (born) by the word of truth.
(James 1:18, R.V.).

The second case is that of a prominent church official, a physician. He approached a Christian worker, an evangelist, and said, "I am in trouble as to my salvation. I have never been at rest about it; I have talked with many Christian workers concerning my condition, and they assure me that I am saved; that I only need to pray more, or read my Bible more, or live closer to the Lord, and be more faithful in my Christian duties. For years I have tried to live right and do my duty. My own father tells me that he knows that I am saved, that he knows just when I was converted. But I am in trouble about it; I have been troubled over it for many years; I fear I am unsaved."

The evangelist asked, "Have you never been at rest about your salvation?"

The physician replied, "I never have; they told me that I was a Christian, and that I ought to do my duty and join the church, and I did. But I have never been at rest; I have always been in trouble and confusion over it."

"Then," said the evangelist, "let God's word show you. The Lord Jesus said, 'Come unto Me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest,'—Matt. 11:28. If you have never been at rest about your salvation, then you have never really come

to the Saviour; you have never been saved. After one comes to the Saviour and receives rest, he may be disturbed, as is shown in Acts 15:1-31; but if you have never been at rest, you have never really come to the Saviour; for God's word says plainly, 'We which have believed do enter into rest,'—Heb. 4:3."

The evangelist labored with the physician, and failed to lead him to believe on the Redeemer. Some nights afterward, as the evangelist was preaching on the text, "Propitiation through faith in His blood,"—Rom. 3:25, he used the expression, "It is all in depending on the blood. Oh, depend on the blood, depend on the blood, depend on the blood and you are safe." A bright look passed over the physician's face, and he turned to a friend and whispered that he saw the way to be saved, and that then and there for the first time he really trusted the Saviour as complete Redeemer. The next day before a large audience he made a statement of his former condition, and stated that the night before he saw what it meant to be saved and had believed on the Saviour as his Redeemer and was for the first time in life at rest about his salvation. In this case begetting of the Spirit, the sanctification of the Spirit (2 Thess. 2:13), had apparently taken place years before, for his holy inclinations and his hatred of sin were manifest to the entire city, *but he had not believed the truth* (2 Thess. 2:13); hence, *he had not been brought forth* (born) *by the word of truth* (James 1:18, R.V.).

The third case is that of an ex-convict. One night in a mission for harlots, drunkards, outcasts, etc., they were having testimonies. Considerable levity had been aroused by some unique, comic and yet pathetic, testimonies. Finally a man arose and said, "Friends, I am a jailbird." At once there was an outburst of laughter. The poor fellow turned quickly and, resting his head upon his arm against the wall, sobbed piteously. The disorderly audience were conscience-smitten and became silent. When the ex-convict could control his feelings, he said, "Yes, friends, I am a jailbird. I have spent thirty years in prison. I was just discharged to-day. I think I was converted just before I left the prison. This life is all a failure to me, and there is not much of it left. I do want to go to Heaven. Please pray for me, that I may be faithful and do my part and finally get to Heaven," and sat down. An evangelist was in the audience, and his heart went out to the poor heart-broken ex-convict. He followed the ex-convict out of the mission that night, and, overtaking him at a quiet street corner, laid his hand on the man's shoulder, and said, "Friend, are you the one who wished us to pray for you that you might do your part and get to Heaven?"

He replied, "Yes, stranger; this life is all a failure, and I do want to go to Heaven when I die. I think I have had a change of heart. I don't want to sin any

more. I do want to hold out and do my part, so I can go to Heaven."

Said the evangelist, "Did you ever hear that God in His word says, 'To him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness?'—Rom. 4:5."

The ex-convict replied quickly, "Stranger, say that again; I never heard that before."

The evangelist repeated the Scripture; explained what justifying the ungodly means, that Christ died for our sins (1 Cor. 15:3); that the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all (Is. 53:6); that the Saviour gave Himself for us that He might redeem us from all iniquity (Titus 2:13, 14); that the one who would cease his own works and believe on the Saviour would be saved; that God had promised in His word, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved"; and then urged the ex-convict to quit working at his own salvation and to trust the whole work to the Saviour. Suddenly, the ex-convict looked up and said, "I will, right now." The evangelist then quoted to him John 5:24; and then urged the poor fellow, not from fear of Hell, not to get to Heaven, for those two questions were now settled, but from love for the Saviour who died for his sins, who redeemed him from all iniquity, to live a noble, holy life; showing him that the Saviour, the night before His crucifixion, took the cup of wine and said, "This is My blood of the new covenant which is

shed for many for the remission of sins,"—Matt. 26:28, and then said, "If you love Me, keep My commandments,"—John 14:15; and that the apostle Paul said, "The love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then all died, and He died for all, that they who live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto Him who died for them, and rose again,"—2 Cor. 5:14.

The subsequent, humble, godly life of this poor man, and his abiding zeal and sacrifices for the salvation of others in his former condition, bore convincing testimony that he was really born again by the word of God (1 Peter 1:23). But previous to this there was the earnest yearning after God, the hatred of sin, the holy inclination, indications of the begetting or sanctification of the Spirit (2 Thess. 2:13).

The fourth case is that of an earnest evangelist. During a worldly life as a young man, he felt that a change had occurred in his life; his friends recognized it, and told him that that change was conversion, and that he ought to unite with the church. He did so, and for years as a prominent church officer and superintendent of the Sunday-school, was looked upon as the most godly Christian in the city. But he had never been at rest about his salvation, hoping that some day he would find rest. Under the preaching of an evangelist he saw clearly that salvation was not in a change of feelings, nor change of spiritual nature, and then holding out faithful in doing one's

part; but that it was wholly in Christ as our Redeemer; that Christ died for our sins (1 Cor. 15:3); that the Saviour did not die for a part of our sins, but all (Titus 2:13, 14); that God's promise of salvation was simple, and plain, and sure, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved."—Acts 16:31. Finally the thought came, "I have been yearning for years to find this, to be at rest about my eternal destiny; now that I have found it, shall I let my church pride stand in the way? Why not count all this but loss and accept the Saviour as my complete Redeemer, and trust the whole of my salvation to Him, once for all, and then serve Him from love, and not any longer in order to get to Heaven?" He is giving his life to-day as an evangelist in leading others to the same decision, to turn from depending on the change within, to depending on the complete eternal redemption from all iniquity through Christ (Titus 2:13, 14; Heb. 9:12).

There was devoutness of life, in a degree, before; there was hatred of sin before; these were indications of the begetting or sanctification of the Spirit (2 Thess. 2:13); but salvation is not in this, but in Christ as Redeemer.

Having considered what is accomplished by the begetting or sanctification of the Spirit, let us consider what is accomplished by the new birth; not salvation, for that is wholly through faith in Christ as Redeemer, as having died for our sins, for all iniquity, and as

having obtained eternal redemption for us (1 Cor. 15:3; Titus 2:13, 14; Heb. 9:12); and the new birth is the result of the faith that saves (James 1:18, R.V.; 1 Peter 1:23; 2 Thess. 2:13). But as the begetting or sanctification of the Spirit gives an actual new spiritual nature; so the new birth, the being brought forth by the word of truth, the being born again by the word of God, gives conscious spiritual life, and new motive power. Consider these:—

As to conscious life: "He that hath the Son hath life,"—1 John 5:12; "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life,"—John 3:36. But the one who has believed on the Son is born again by the word of God (1 Peter 1:23); hence, "He that believeth on the Son of God *hath the witness in himself*,"—1 John 5:10; he has a conscious new life. "The Spirit Himself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God,"—Rom. 8:16 (R.V. and 1911 Bible). Before birth no human being has conscious life to which the father could bear witness that he is the father. And this new life is *everlasting* life,— "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on Me hath EVERLASTING life,"—John 6:47; "I give unto them ETERNAL LIFE, and they shall never perish,"—John 10:28.

Earthly adoptions are imperfect because the one adopting often finds in the one adopted a perverse nature that remains in rebellion against the nature of the one who adopted. That would be ideal adop-

tion where the one adopting could implant in the one adopted his own nature and life. That is God's adoption: "When the fulness of the time was come God sent forth His Son born of a woman, born under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. And *because ye are sons* God hath sent forth the *Spirit of His Son into your hearts*, crying Abba, Father. Wherefore thou art no more a servant but a son,"—Gal. 4:4-7. The believer, therefore, is not only redeemed from under the law and, in a new relation to God, adopted as *son*, but *God has given him a new spiritual nature, and has "sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts."*

But the one with a new spiritual nature begotten of the Spirit and then brought forth by the word of truth (James 1:18, R.V.), born again by the word of God (1 Peter 1:23), not only has a new conscious life, but an altogether new motive power.

The failure in many of the periodicals and books on morals and much of the utterances of the platform and pulpit, to discriminate between *the motive* and *the deed*, and to give first place to the motive, is one of the indications of the shallow thinking of a shallow age. Men who are looked upon as very learned write what are called great books on morals and ethics, and these books are taught in great universities and colleges, and alas! in religious colleges, and in these books Christianity is compared with the heathen religions, and the heathen religions and

teachers are lauded and commended; and yet the authors have simply compared *deeds* and failed utterly *to go to the motive back of the deed*, or to *give the motive the first place*. Grant that heathen religions teach the doing of many so-called good deeds, *what is the motive back of the deed?* All heathen religions and religious teachers, and religions that are called Christian that are false, *without exception*, have as the motive back of the deed, *either fear or selfishness*. Only true Christianity, true Scripture teaching bases all service to God on love. *And only the redeemed man born again* by the word of God (1 Peter 1:23) really has that as the motive power of life. Many others claim to have it, but are blinded; for *only* the redeemed man, born again by the word of God, *can* have this motive, as will be hereafter shown.

Without the Scriptures as from God the world has no correct standard of morals. Let the Scriptures tell us what love is:—

The Saviour defines what love is: "There was a certain creditor who had two debtors: the one owed five hundred pence, and the other fifty. And when they had nothing to pay, he frankly forgave them both. Tell me, therefore, which of them will love him most? Simon answered and said, I suppose that he to whom he forgave most, and He said unto him, Thou hast rightly judged,"—Luke 7:41-43.

Paul defines love: "The love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge that if one died for all, then

160 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

all died; and He died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves but unto Him who died for them and rose again,"—2 Cor. 5:14, 15, R.V.

John defines love: "Hereby know we love because He laid down His life for us,"—1 John 3:16, R.V.; "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins,"—1 John 4:10; "We love, because He first loved us,"—1 John 4:19, R.V.

In the nature of the case no one has this love as the motive power of life, no one *can* have it, before he is redeemed through the blood of Christ (Eph. 1:7), and thus born again by the word of God (1 Peter 1:23). He may call his motive love, but what Jesus and Paul and John define as love is the motive of love in the sight of God. Many have labelled their fear of being lost, their fear of Hell, and called it love, and thus deceived themselves into believing that they are real Christians, serving God from love; and many have labelled their desire to get to Heaven, their fear of not getting to Heaven, and called it love, and thus deceived themselves into believing that they are real Christians, serving God from love; but only those who are redeemed from all iniquity and thus born again by the word of God *can* have their motive purified and have what God calls love (1 Peter 1:23; Titus 2:13, 14; 2 Cor. 5:14, 15).

Notwithstanding God has thus made plain what the

motive must be and what love is, many religious teachers will waive this all aside and join with the thoughtless, godless world in saying that these distinctions do not matter much; that one cannot be very wrong so long as the deeds are right. But the very point at issue is, *what are good deeds?* Deeds take their character *only* from the motive back of the deed. The most heartless and haughty and indifferent concerning this question of motive in our service of God, would be quick to consider the motive in earthly relations. Let one of these learn that the motive prompting his wife in all of her deeds is fear of him, fear that he will poison or otherwise murder her, and he would spurn such service. Let one of these learn that the young man who is trying to win his daughter is prompted, not by love, but by a desire for access to her father's bank account, fearing that he may suffer in the future unless he can win her, and that father will spurn such a suitor from his door, and yet he will turn and serve God from fear of being lost or from fear of not getting to Heaven, and will call himself a Christian, and think that God cares not for the motive so the deed is there! Is God less than man! Yet that is what such men would make Him.

Far back in the Old Testament God gave fair warning concerning this present-day fearfully widespread mistake: "The Lord seeth not as man seeth; for man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord *looketh on the heart*,"—1 Sam. 16:17. Let one who

knew how God measures the deed by the motive tell us: "Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not love, I am become as sounding brass, or a clanging cymbal; and though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not love, I am nothing. And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not love, it profiteth me nothing,"—1 Cor. 13: 1-3, R.V. and 1911 Bible.

Let it be repeated, *no one has, no one can have*, this motive until he is redeemed from the curse of the law, eternally redeemed, redeemed from all iniquity (Gal. 3:13; Heb. 9:12; Titus 2:13, 14), and thus born again by the word of God (1 Peter 1:23). To use a crude but simple illustration: suppose there were five hundred parts of a man's salvation, and the Saviour's redemption provides for four hundred and ninety-nine parts, and if the man did not himself provide the other one part he would be lost, would never reach Heaven. He might have much love for the Saviour for having provided for the four hundred and ninety-nine parts; *yet in the nature of the case*, the motive prompting him in making sure of the one remaining part would be fear of being lost, fear of not attaining Heaven. He might *name* his motive love, but God "looketh on the heart."

So then, the new birth gives a new conscious life

and a new motive power prompting that life; a new motive power prompting a new spiritual nature that hates sin and inclines to holiness. Hence, the apostle John says, "Every one that hath this hope set on Him purifieth himself,"—1 John 3:3, R.V. Hypocrites do not, and many that honestly believe that they are born again, yet really are not, and hence have not the new nature and the new motive, do not; but "Every one that hath this hope set on Him purifieth himself."

For Further Study:—Some reader may question the correctness of the Revised Version rendering of James 1:18 which has been used in this chapter, "Of His own will brought He us forth by the word of truth," and think that the old or Authorized King James Version is the correct rendering, "Of His own will begat He us with the word of truth." The Revised Version is undoubtedly the correct translation. That the reader who is unacquainted with the Greek may see that the Revised Version "brought He us forth" is correct and that the King James "Begot He us" is wrong, let him notice James 1:15, where in both versions it reads, "Bringeth forth death." The Greek word translated here "bringeth forth" is the same word that in verse eighteen the Revised Version correctly renders "brought He us forth."

The word translated "begat," "begotten," in the Scriptures is sometimes translated "born." It is not

easy, in every case, to tell which should be the exact rendering. Because we are born again by the word of God (1 Peter 1:23), brought forth (born) by the word of the truth (James 1:18, R.V.), as the child is brought forth by the mother, the begetting or sanctification is of the Spirit (2 Thess. 2:13). As a rule, then, though there may be exceptions, whenever the word translated "begat" or "born" is used in connection with the Spirit as the source of the new nature, it means to beget; wherever it is used in connection with the belief of the truth, it means "born," and wherever the whole process is referred to God, it means "born." But whatever name we give the work, invariably in the Scriptures wherever the Spirit's work and the belief of the truth or the taking away of sin are mentioned together, the work of the Spirit is first. And sometimes clearly, though possibly not always, considerable time comes between the primary work of the Spirit, and redemption or belief of the truth which results in the new birth. Take as an example 1 Peter 1:2: "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ."

The expression "change of heart" is not strictly, literally, true; though, as a matter of fact, what is *called* a "change of heart" is there, and there are two of them instead of one. There is a change when the new spiritual nature is implanted by the Holy Spirit

which produces a hatred of sin and an inclination to holiness; then there is another change when the new nature is born again by the word of God (1 Peter 1:23), which brings rest (Matt. 11:28; Heb. 4:3), and fear, the old motive power, is taken away: "Ye have not received the Spirit of bondage again to fear: but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father,"—Rom. 8:15; and the new motive of love takes its place: "The love of Christ constraineth us,"—2 Cor. 5:14; "There is no fear in love, but perfect love casteth out fear,"—1 John 4:18. So that there are clearly two changes instead of one.

But that the old nature is not changed is clearly taught in the Scriptures. That the flesh, the old nature, is left as it was, is shown by the apostle Paul: "We know that the law is spiritual; but I am, as fleshly, sold under sin. For that which I do I do not approve; for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I. If then I do that which I would not, I consent unto the law that it is good. Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. For I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, good dwelleth not; for to will is present with me; but to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I would, I do not, but the evil which I would not, that I do. Now if I do what I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God

166 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

after the inward man; but I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me out of this body of death?"—Rom. 7:14-24, 1911 Bible. There are here two separate natures at war. There is a nature that *delights* in the law of God,—the inner man; but there is another nature at constant war with this nature that delights in the law of God.

Likewise in Gal. 5:17, R.V., "The flesh lusteth against the Spirit and the Spirit against the flesh; for they are contrary the one to the other; that ye may not do the things that ye would." Here, clearly, the fleshly nature remains.

As a rule, Christians can realize that there has been no change of nature; that they yet have every passion and appetite that they had before they were born again. And just as really, just as distinctly, they can recognize the new nature warring against the old.

It is not here denied that God has the power to entirely change the old nature and take away former appetites and passions; nor is it denied that God has done so in certain cases. Earnest Christian men have testified that in conversion old appetites and passions were taken away. Such cases are cited in "Twice Born Men" and elsewhere. This is not denied. God is sovereign. But this is not God's usual, ordinary

way. His plan is to leave the old and implant a new spiritual nature resulting in new spiritual life and new motive power. And the wisdom of this is easily seen. If the old nature were changed, if all appetites and passions were taken away, where would there be any virtue, any merit, in serving God? Where would there be any development of character? Where would there be anything praiseworthy or deserving in a right life? Man would then be but a mere machine. But if when temptations strong and powerful come, there is a nature to which they powerfully appeal, and yet another nature within, which, from love to God, love to the Saviour for complete, eternal redemption, wars against them and overcomes,—then there is virtue, there is glory to God, there is development of character along the highest lines.

There is another work of the Spirit with the sinner that does not come properly into the realm of this discussion, which is neither the begetting nor the birth of the new nature, namely, the work of reproving, convincing, convicting the world of sin, and of righteousness and of judgment (John 16:8-11; John 1:9). This work of the Spirit some men resist to their own destruction; this work of the Spirit pricks men in their hearts (Acts 2:37); this work of the Spirit opens the sinner's heart to give attention to the message from God (Acts 16:14). An old Christian Indian in the South who had been a very wicked Indian, in telling of his salvation, said, "I was bad Indian;

drink; fight. Heard white man preach and people sing; Indian like singing; no like preach; me no feel him; after while me feel him."

A similar testimony to this convicting work of the Spirit was given by a Chinaman who asked to be baptized. The preacher said, "Tell us how you found the Saviour." The Chinaman replied, "Me no find Him 'tall; He find me."—He came "to *seek* and to save that which was lost."—Luke 19:10.

One does not have to understand about the Spirit's work or to realize its different steps, to be saved. To the ignorant jailer who asked, "What must I do to be saved?"—Acts 16:30, there were no instructions in detail as to the Spirit's work, but the simple answer was given, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved,"—Acts 16:31. Likewise, when Peter went to the household of Cornelius to tell them words by which they would be saved (Acts 11:14), he did not instruct them concerning the new birth, but said, "To Him give all the prophets witness that through His name whosoever believeth on Him shall receive remission of sins,"—Acts 10:43. True is the statement of Kuyper on this point: "There may be persons ignorant of these stages, which are as indispensable as milestones to the surveyor; they may never be made to oppress the souls of the simple. He who breathes deeply, unconscious of his lungs, is often the healthiest."

Let two unusual cases of the Spirit's work and yet

no belief of the truth, no believing on Christ, be taken from "The Varieties of Religious Experience," by Prof. Wm. James:—

"Here is a longer and more developed experience from a manuscript communication by a clergyman,—I take it from Starbuck's manuscript collection:—

"I remember the night, and almost the very spot on the hilltop, where my soul opened out, as it were, into the Infinite, and there was a rushing together of the two worlds, the inner and the outer. It was deep calling unto deep,—the deep that my own struggle had opened up within being answered by the unfathomable deep without, and all the beauty of the world, and love and sorrow, and even temptation. I did not seek Him, but felt the perfect unison of my spirit with His. The ordinary sense of things around me faded. For the moment nothing but an ineffable joy and exaltation remained. It is impossible to fully describe the experience. It was like the effect of some great orchestra when all the separate notes have melted into one swelling harmony that leaves the listener conscious of nothing save that his soul is being wafted upwards, and almost bursting with its own emotion. The perfect stillness of the night was thrilled by a more solemn silence. The darkness held a presence that was all the more felt because it was not seen. I could not any more have doubted that He was there than that I was. Indeed, I felt myself to be, if possible, the less real of the two!"

Here the clergyman claims that he was born anew of the Spirit, and yet he states that it was independent of belief. Then as surely as we are born again *by the word of God* (1 Peter 1:23), this man was not at this time born again. It could have been, and doubtless was, the begetting or sanctification of the Spirit, but it was not the new birth.

Again, from Prof. Wm. James, "Here is another document, even more definite in character, which, the writer being a Swiss, I translate from the French original:—

"‘I was in perfect health: we were on our sixth day of tramping, and in good training. We had come the day before from Sixt to Trient by Buet. I felt neither fatigue, hunger, nor thirst, and my state of mind was equally healthy. I had had at Forlaz good news from home; I was subject to no anxiety, either near or remote, for we had a good guide, and there was not a shadow of uncertainty about the road we should follow. I can best describe the condition in which I was, by calling it a state of equilibrium. When all at once I experienced a feeling of being raised above myself. I felt the presence of God—I tell of the thing just as I was conscious of it—as if his goodness and his power were penetrating me altogether. The throb of emotion was so violent that I could barely tell the boys to pass on and wait for me. I then sat down on a stone, unable to stand any longer, and my eyes overflowed with tears. I thanked God

that in the course of my life he had taught me to know him, that he sustained my life and took pity both on the insignificant creature and on the sinner that I was. I begged him ardently that my life might be consecrated to the doing of his will. I felt his reply, which was that I should do his will from day to day, in humility and poverty, leaving him, the Almighty God, to be judge of whether I should some time be called to bear witness more conspicuously. Then, slowly, the ecstasy left my heart; that is, I felt that God had withdrawn the communion which he had granted, and I was able to walk on, but very slowly, so strongly was I still possessed by the interior emotion. Besides, I had wept uninterruptedly for several minutes, my eyes were swollen, and I did not wish my companions to see me. The state of ecstasy may have lasted four or five minutes, although it seemed at the time to last much longer. My comrades waited for me ten minutes at the cross of Barine, but I took about twenty-five or thirty minutes to join them, for as well as I can remember, they said that I had kept them back for about half an hour. The impression had been so profound that in climbing slowly the slope I asked myself if it were possible that Moses on Sinai could have had a more intimate communication with God.' ”

Let the reader note carefully that in this case there is no reference to the Saviour at all; no reference to the truth; then this person was not at this time born

172 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

again *by the word of God* (1 Peter 1:23); he may have been, and doubtless was, begotten or sanctified by the Spirit at this time.

Not every one that is begotten or sanctified by the Spirit has the extraordinary experience of these two; but these are not cases of real conversion or salvation, but of the first work of the Spirit, the begetting or sanctification of the Spirit which comes before belief of the truth.

VII

NO RIGHT MOTIVE BEFORE THE NEW BIRTH

Not only is there no salvation in the begetting of the Spirit, or sanctification of the Spirit (2 Thess. 2:13), for salvation is through belief of the truth (Rom. 1:16; 1 Cor. 15:1-3; Acts 16:31); but there is no right motive produced by the begetting or sanctification of the Spirit. This work of the Spirit implants a new spiritual nature, and not a new motive power. It is not enough that the rebellious son shall be given a disposition to obey the father, if the motive prompting the obedience is fear that the father will kill him if he should not obey. It is not enough that the wayward wife shall be given a disposition to be faithful to her husband, if the prompting motive is fear that her husband will poison her or desert her if she is not faithful. It is not enough that the sinner shall be given a nature that inclines toward obeying God, if the motive prompting obedience is fear of being lost, or fear of not attaining Heaven. In the first place, the sinner, though begotten or sanctified by the Spirit, is still a lost, justly condemned sinner, still under God's law, still unredeemed. He has not

174 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

yet accepted by faith complete, eternal redemption from all iniquity through the blood of Christ (Rom. 3:25; Heb. 9:12; Titus 2:13, 14), and God's unalterable alternative faces him, "Apart from shedding of blood there is no remission,"—Heb. 9:22, R.V.

In the second place, in the nature of things, he has not the new motive that comes *only* as a result of complete, eternal redemption from the curse of the law, from all iniquity (2 Cor. 5:14, 15; Gal. 3:13; Titus 2:13, 14).

The one begotten or sanctified by the Spirit is just as much under God's law, is just as surely condemned by it, and just as much needs redemption as the sinner who has not been begotten or sanctified by the Spirit. The man who stole a horse and now hates his sin is just as surely under the condemnation of the law as the man who stole a horse and does not hate his sin. So the one who has broken God's law and has been begotten or sanctified by the Spirit, and now hates sin, is just as surely under the condemnation of God's violated law as the one who has violated God's law and does not hate his sin. Sorrow for the crime does not pay for horse stealing.

And God's eternal fiat, "Apart from shedding of blood there is no remission,"—Heb. 9:22, R.V., applies just as surely to one unredeemed person as to another, for there is no redemption blood in a new spiritual nature.

Now because the one begotten by the Spirit or

sanctified by the Spirit but not yet brought forth (born) by the word of truth (James 1:18, R.V.), not yet born again by the word of God (1 Peter 1:23), is yet under the law, is yet unredeemed from the curse of the law (Gal. 3:13), is yet not redeemed from all iniquity (Titus 2:13, 14), is yet not eternally redeemed (Heb. 9:12), the old motive of fear remains, and can never be taken away until that which *produces* the new motive of love has been brought to bear on the new nature implanted by the Spirit. The one who *is forgiven* most *will love* most (Luke 7:41-43); "The love of Christ constraineth us BECAUSE we thus judge that if one died for all then all died; and He died for all, THAT they who live should not henceforth live unto themselves but unto Him who died for them and rose again,"—2 Cor. 5:14, 15, 1911 Bible and R.V.

Hence there is, there can be, no right motive before the new birth.

Shall any one, from the most learned writer on morals and ethics to the most ignorant or most depraved, set aside the question of motive power as one of slight importance? Shall we write God down as a being who cares nothing for motive, when even the lowest of men value motive and measure the deed by the motive? Shall men say that God, in His plan with men, had no concern for the motive back of the deed? That He has made no provisions for purifying the motive of life? Shall men claiming to be teachers of morals and ethics have so little concern even for them-

176 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

selves as to write themselves down as giving no consideration to the question of the motive back of the deed? Shall men preach much and write much about "Salvation by character," and then blindly stumble on through the fog which they themselves have created, and their befogged brains never see that character comes from the motive prompting the deed?

Whether or not men shall turn from their poor, pitiable intellectual pride and realize that the motive *must* be right for the deed to be right, that the motive measures the deed, God has plainly revealed that His purpose is to purify the motive power of life, and that the motive is of the first concern; for of the Redeemer it is said, "He died for all, THAT they who live should not henceforth live to themselves, but for Him who died for them and rose again,"—2 Cor. 5:15; hence, "*the love of Christ constraineth us*,"—2 Cor. 5:14; not the fear of being lost, nor the fear of not reaching Heaven, nor a cold-blooded sense of duty. The apostle Paul, because it is essential that the motive be right, therefore says, "Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not love, I am become as sounding brass or a clanging cymbal. And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not love, I am nothing. And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not love, it profiteth me

nothing,"—1 Cor. 13:1-3. But, as this is the right motive for service, and as this motive can be produced only by complete redemption through Christ, and as the new birth comes by the word of God (1 Peter 1:23), by belief of the truth (2 Thess. 2:13), it follows that there can be no right motive before the new birth.

No heathen religion considers the motive back of the deed; no heathen religion appeals to the motive of love in religious service, and all false theories of Christianity and all religious errorists among professing Christians ignore it.

"‘Why do you pray to a devil?’ I asked a venerable Hindoo in Southern India. ‘Sahib,’ he replied, ‘why should I pray to a God who is good?’"—*Begbie in "Other Sheep."* The only motive the poor heathen knows is fear; but it is the same motive with those who believe that, to win the approval of God, one must achieve a character that will merit approval.

Prof. Granger, quoted by Begbie in "Souls in Action," well says, "When religion is represented as the most refined way of providing for the ultimate future, and a not unprofitable investment for the present, it is classed on its own showing with the business pursuits, which even those who are engaged in them treat, not as ends in themselves, but as means."

Not only does complete, eternal redemption through Christ produce purity of motive, but it gives the most powerful motive known to human beings. As showing

the power of the motive of love let three cases be cited:—

One night in a Western city as an evangelist arose to preach, a shabbily dressed man, with shaggy beard and hair, came in and sat down in the rear of the building. When the evangelist pressed the teaching that every sin deserved just punishment, there would come the look of the demon on the haggard face; when he brought out the teaching that Christ died for our sins, that He redeems from all iniquity, the distorted countenance would soften, and there would come over the face a look of intense hungering and yearning. On inquiry after preaching the evangelist learned that the man was a noted drunkard and wife-beater of the city, and that the night before he had beaten up and driven away his wife and children and had broken up his home. For two weeks every night the poor drunkard came. Finally one night as the people were passing out, the drunkard passed by the platform, and reaching up for the evangelist's hand, said, "Look a-here, young fellow, the way you are putting this thing looks like there is some hope for me yet," and he turned his face away and began sobbing.

The evangelist, holding to the drunkard's hand and laying his left hand on the drunkard's shoulder, said, "God bless you, R——, if you only knew what it meant, you could lie down to sleep to-night certain of a home in Heaven."

Between his sobs, the wretched man said, "Well, it does look that way sometimes, from the way you are preaching."

Until far past midnight the drunkard and the evangelist sat upon the steps of the church. The evangelist was pressing upon the drunkard, Rom. 4:5, "To him that *worketh not*, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness"; showing him that the Saviour *justifies* the ungodly; that the *ungodly* are the ones He justifies; that He justifies them from *all* iniquity (Titus 2:13, 14); that He justifies "him that *worketh not*, but believeth on Him."

Each time as the evangelist would urge the drunkard to a decision, he would say, "Yes, I will promise God I will never drink any more."

"No, R——, that is trying to buy salvation with your promises, when He says, 'To him that *worketh not*,' that He justifies the *ungodly*."

He would reply, "Doesn't God want me to promise not to sin any more?"

"Not to be saved. Not once in the Bible does God ask us to make any promise in order to be saved. After you accept the Saviour and trust the whole of your salvation to Him, then live a good life and serve Him from love to Him for having died for your sins, that He might justify you."

Of a sudden R—— threw his arms around the

evangelist and, sobbing tenderly, whispered, "I've trusted Him."

The evangelist then repeated to him John 5:24, and urged him, from love to the Saviour, to become a noble, useful man. Two years afterwards R—— was known as one of the most faithful Christians in the city. Sixteen years afterward, a thousand miles away, as the evangelist dismissed a congregation, a white-haired man came down the aisle and said, "Do you know me?" and bowing his head on the pulpit wept for some time; lifting his head, he said, "I am going to have an unbroken family in Heaven. My wife and all of my children are now Christians."

The second case to be cited showing the power of the motive of love is that of a most wicked woman, a woman noted for her life of sin. A minister, one morning in an American city, was asked to step to the door. There stood at the door a white-haired woman.

She said, "I am Mrs. T——." At once the minister recognized her as the most notorious woman in the city. "Did you say in preaching last night that the Saviour said, 'Him that cometh unto Me I will in no wise cast out'?"

"Yes, madam," replied the minister, "the Saviour made that promise; it is in the sixth chapter of the gospel of John, the thirty-seventh verse."

"Can it be possible!" exclaimed the poor woman. "I did not go to sleep at all last night; all night I lay

awake thinking about it; wondering if He really said it, and wondering if He meant it for every one, and if He would really save me."

The minister explained that Christ died for our sins (1 Cor. 15:3), that He redeems us from all iniquity (Titus 2:13, 14); that God had promised, "Come now and let us reason together, saith the Lord: though your sins be as scarlet they shall be as white as snow,"—Is. 1:18; that "the blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sins,"—1 John 1:7; that God's message is, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved,"—Acts 16:31; hence, that Jesus promised, "Him that cometh unto Me I will in no wise cast out,"—John 6:37. When the aged sinful woman realized what it meant and accepted the Saviour as her complete, eternal Redeemer, the minister showed her John 5:24, and it was affecting to see her weeping and rejoicing, as she realized that she was really saved (Eph. 2:8, R.V.). The minister then showed her that from love to the Saviour who died for her sins (1 Cor. 15:3) and saved her from Hell, she ought to give Him her entire life's service; that if she did, He would reward her according to her service (1 Cor. 3:11-15); that she would not be rewarded for how much she accomplished but for her faithfulness (Mark 12:41-44); that she was not only saved, but a child of God (Gal. 3:26; 4:4-7); that God would chasten His disobedient children (Ps. 89:27-34; Heb. 12:5-8); but that because she was re-

deemed from all iniquity (Titus 2:13-14), her entire life ought to be given in service to the Lord from love to Him for saving her.

For eight years following, this once sinful woman was unswerving in her faithfulness and tender devotion. As an example, in her first year as a Christian, twenty-seven people were led by her to become Christians and to unite with the church, and thirty pupils were by her brought into the Sunday-school; many of these were poor, and she bought the cloth and made the clothing that they might be able to come to Sunday-school. Being a woman of some means, she quietly helped every good cause. When she died, a will was found, leaving all she had to help in the Lord's work, but it was found that she had already given it all away. Eight years before when she united with the church her profession of faith in Christ was the joke of the city, and met with jeers and derision. But eight years afterward, the withered body, worn out in service for her Redeemer, was followed to the cemetery by one of the largest funeral processions ever seen in the city, and the children of the poor wept as her body was borne along the streets.

Let those who believe with Prof. James, of Harvard, in his "Varieties of Religious Experience," that the "sub-conscious self" is a sufficient explanation for all religious experiences; that "every religious phenomenon has its history and its derivation from natural antecedents"; who join with him in saying

concerning real Christians that "no splendor worthy of a wholly supernatural creature fulgurates from them or sets them apart from the mortals who have never experienced that favor,"—let them furnish a case similar to this as a result of believing any of their theories. Who ever heard of any one whose life was thus permanently changed by believing in any theory of infidelity? Prof. James says, "Converted men as a class are indistinguishable from natural men." Let any one go where this woman lived and died and say that she was, after conversion, indistinguishable from women with whom she was formerly classed and of whom she was a leader, and ten thousand living witnesses will protest. But even if there were parallel cases outside of those redeemed from all iniquity by the Saviour, *what of the motive?* *The motive of love* was not the prompting motive, and God looks at *the motive* (1 Cor. 13:1-3, R.V.).

The third case to show the power of the motive of love (and scores of authentic cases crowd into memory), is that of a prominent business man of the West, a man of keen intellect and splendid accomplishments, easily the first citizen of his city. He had been trained under the teaching of salvation by character, and to look with derision upon the teaching of salvation by complete redemption through the Saviour dying for our sins (Titus 2:13, 14; 1 Cor. 15:3). Hearing a minister preach salvation complete and instantaneous through Christ's redemption, he be-

came interested and sought an interview with the minister. For more than an hour the minister explained the way of salvation to him, showing that our sins were laid on the Saviour (Is. 53:5, 6); that He died for our sins (1 Cor. 15:3); that He redeemed us from all iniquity (Titus 2:13, 14); that all who believed on Him would be saved (Acts 16:31); that the believer was saved at once and not at the end of life (John 5:24; Eph. 2:8, R.V.). The earnest inquirer brought forward many objections which were answered by the minister.

Finally he said, "Mr. Blank, it seems to me that such a way of salvation, that Christ redeems from all iniquity, and that all who believe on Him shall be saved and have already everlasting life and shall not come into condemnation, would make men indifferent and would be a premium on crime."

"Oh, sir," replied the minister, "you forget the new motive power in the Christian life. 'The love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then all died; and He died for all, that they who live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto Him who died for them, and rose again,'—2 Cor. 5:14, 15. Why, sir, you would love a dog that would save your life. How much more would you love the Saviour who died for all your sins that He might give you eternal life? (John 10:28). And from love to Him those who are really saved will strive to live as He would have them live."

The Nicodemus bowed his head upon the table, and losing all self-control wept bitterly for some time.

Lifting his head he said to the minister, " Mr. Blank, pardon my weakness, but it flashed upon me what a different man in character I would be to-night had I been shown this thirty years ago. You know my two great besetting sins. For thirty years I have been taught salvation by character, that my hope was to overcome these besetting sins. I have for thirty years made my battle from fear, and now my character is all warped from this slavish motive of fear."

He then and there accepted complete, eternal redemption through Christ. Long since the two great besetting sins have been overcome, and there is possibly to-day no nobler Christian business man in the West. His life is nearing its sunset; there are a quiet peace and rest and cheerfulness around his life; and without any blare of trumpets, but in an unassuming way, he is laboring and sacrificing and trying to further the cause of Him who loved him and gave Himself for him (Gal. 2:20); not from fear, not to gain Heaven, but from a higher motive.

"I love Thee, O Christ,
Not because I hope to gain Heaven thereby;
But because Thou, O Christ,
For me didst die."

For Further Study:—It is not that men cannot see the distinction as to motive; it is not that they cannot realize the vast difference between the motive of

love and all other motives, that they do not give it due consideration and weight; but it is because no other religion teaches this as the motive power of life; it is because this motive *cannot* be produced in any other way than through the complete redemption by the Saviour; and because, therefore, to stress this as *the motive* of life would mean to take the position that all other religions are radically wrong and not from God, which would be "narrow" and "bigoted" and not "broad-minded" and "liberal," that many ignore the question of motive. "Broad" men are in the "broad" way and "broad is the way that leadeth to destruction and many are they that enter in thereby,"—Matt. 7:13, R.V.

Learned men who, in their comparisons of religions, and in their teachings as to morals and ethics, and in their own lives, give no consideration to the question of the motive prompting the deed, put themselves on a level with the principle-less country lad who threw principle to the winds. His father, a farmer, killed a raccoon, and promised to give the skin, which was worth a few cents, to the son who agreed with him in politics. He called the boys into his presence separately. The eldest, when asked what he was, replied, "I am a Republican." The father said, "Stand aside; you don't get the skin." The second son came in and when asked, said that he was a Democrat. The father said, "Stand aside; you don't get the skin." The third came in and said that he was a Prohibition-

ist. The father said, "Stand aside; you don't get the skin." The youngest came in and when asked to state what he was, asked, "What did William and Sam and John say?" The father replied, "I don't want you to answer that way, but from principle." The lad replied, "Oh principle, nothing! I am after the coon skin." It is bad enough for the baser sort of politicians to act as this boy, but it is sad to see that great leaders of religious thought waive aside the all-important question of the motive back of the deed.

It is an expression of frequent recurrence, "It doesn't matter what one believes, just so he lives right." But belief produces motive, and motive measures the deed. One *cannot* live right when his motive is wrong; and the motive is right *only* when it is love (1 Cor. 13:1-3, R.V.), and it cannot be love until one is "forgiven most" (Luke 7:41-43); and one can only be forgiven most through Christ's death for our sins (2 Cor. 5:14, 15, R.V.); and Christ's dying for our sins saves only those who believe on Him (Acts 16:31). One, therefore, cannot live right until his belief about the Redeemer is right. Hence, "The fleshly mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh *cannot please God*,"—Rom. 7:7, 8. God's word stresses the motive power, "In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but faith working through

love,"—Gal. 5:6; and faith works through love only when it is faith in the Saviour as complete Redeemer (Titus 2:13, 14).

One of the most ingenious, misleading books of recent years is "The Varieties of Religious Experience," by Prof. Wm. James of Harvard University. Let the reader note how he ignores motive power in the religious life:

"At any rate you must all be ready now to judge the religious life by its results exclusively." The motive, then, deserves no consideration. It is surprising that one so learned should fall into such an error; yet it is just that error that many writers on morals and ethics have fallen into and which has led them so far astray.

Prof. James further states that mind-curers have demonstrated that "there is a form of regeneration by relaxation; by letting go; psychologically indistinguishable from the Lutheran justification by faith and the Wesleyan acceptance of free grace." If Prof. James and other psychologists cannot distinguish between Luther's justification by faith in Christ as Redeemer, dying for our sins, and Wesley's acceptance of free grace made possible through this redemption through Christ (which they both taught), and the consequent motive of love instead of fear, whereas mind-curers deny any need for redemption and in their pride turn from Christ as Redeemer, as substitute, and scorn the necessity for redemption,

and therefore have not the Scripture motive of love,—then psychology as a science is of little worth.

But Prof. James again: "How is it with their fruits? If we except the class of pre-eminent saints of whom the names illumine history, and consider only the usual run of 'saints,' the shop-keeping church members and ordinary youthful or middle-aged recipients of instantaneous conversion, whether at revivals or in the spontaneous course of Methodistic growth, you will probably agree that no splendor worthy of a wholly supernatural creature fulgurates from them or sets them apart from the mortals who have never experienced that favor. Were it true that a suddenly converted man, as such, is, as Edwards says, of an entirely different kind from a natural man, partaking as he does directly of Christ's substance, there surely ought to be some exquisite class-mark, some distinctive radiance attaching even to the lowest specimen of this genus, to which no one else could remain insensible, and which, so far as it went, would prove him more excellent than even the most highly gifted among merely natural men. But notoriously there is no such radiance. Converted men as a class are indistinguishable from natural men; some natural men even excel some converted men in their fruits; and no one ignorant of doctrinal theology could guess by mere everyday inspection of the 'accidents' of the two groups of persons before him that their

substance differed as much as divine differs from human substances."

Most earnestly does the author challenge this sweeping, insidious, misleading statement of the learned Harvard Professor.

Why limit? Why rule out the "pre-eminent saints"? Why rule out Moody, Spurgeon, George Muhler, S. H. Hadley, Jerry McAuley? Is that *science*?—to rule out all of the most evident, notable phenomena in a given field and then bring forward a theory which would be utterly overthrown were the ruled-out phenomena considered? Yet this pitiable begging of the question is put forth by the learned Harvard psychologist as science! Let the reader give attention to an analysis of this deliverance:—

When Prof. James rules out the pre-eminent saints (who would ruin his theory, and for whom he cannot account on naturalistic grounds) and rules down to obscure ones, he makes it difficult to get sufficient data, for much of the lives of the obscure ones is hidden from the public, and those who know the inwardness of these obscure lives would not be accepted as competent, reliable witnesses by Prof. James, and those who think with him. But there are many, many of these obscure ones who, while their names do not "illuminate history," are living far more sacrificing, holy, devoted lives than "the most highly gifted among merely natural men." The author could take those who think with the Professor to the mining

camp of Colorado and show in the humble homes of some of the miners as godly, consecrated lives as the lives of the pre-eminent saints whom the Professor, for obvious reasons, adroitly rules out of consideration; he could take him to the old Jerry McAuley Mission in New York, or to the Pacific Garden Mission in Chicago, and do likewise. Where are those among "merely natural men" who are giving their lives in service as those in "Twice Born Men"? Or those in "Down in Water Street"? Let those who train with the Harvard Professor produce another "Twice Born Men," or another "Down in Water Street," from the lives of "merely natural men." And let it be a fair test; let them come from pure heathenism and not from men and women whose lives and surroundings have been largely molded by the influences of Christianity.

In reply to the statement of Prof. James, "Some natural men even excel some converted men in their fruits," let three things be noted:—

First, some who profess to be converted are not really redeemed, not really born again, and their motive is fear of being lost, or trying to make sure of Heaven, of being saved, or a cold sense of duty, just the motives prompting "natural men"; and some of them are hypocrites, not even trying to live moral, correct lives.

Second, many really redeemed people are not living as noble lives as some who are not redeemed, for the

192 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

reasons that they are mere babes in Christ, and they inherited far weaker, more corrupt natures than these moral "natural men" inherited. "You ought to control your temper," said a moral unredeemed man to a weak redeemed one; "Control temper?" came the quick reply, "I control more temper in one hour than you do in ten years." Many who are really redeemed, before they were redeemed were far worse warped and corrupted by habit than some unredeemed men have been. Do not judge a house harshly until it is completed. Some redeemed ones have not yet had the roof and the weather-boards put on. Let it be remembered that the redemption and the new birth do not change the flesh, the old nature, but that they mean redemption from under the law (Gal. 4:5), and eternal redemption from all iniquity (Heb. 9:12; Titus 2:13, 14), and a new spiritual nature, a new birth (1 Peter 1:23); and that the flesh, the old nature, is not changed. "The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye may not do the things that ye would,"—Gal. 5:17, 1911 Bible and R.V. But this would never be, if the old nature, the flesh, were changed in the new birth.

Third, there is another vast difference between the moral, upright unredeemed and the weak redeemed: not only is the moral, upright unredeemed resting under God's violated law ("for all have sinned,"—Rom. 3:23) and under God's solemn, eternal, un-

changeable alternative, "Apart from shedding of blood there is no remission,"—Heb. 9:22, R.V.; while the weak redeemed is redeemed and not under the law (Gal. 4:4-7; Rom. 6:14), and eternally redeemed from all iniquity (Heb. 9:12; Titus 2:13, 14); but *the motive* of the two is as the poles apart. The motive prompting the redeemed one in what he does do, is love (2 Cor. 5:14, 15), while the motive of the moral, upright unredeemed one, whatever it is, is not this love, and cannot please God (Rom. 7:7,8). One wife is ideal in conduct because she is afraid her husband will murder her if she is not ideal in conduct; another is ideal in conduct because she wishes to constantly draw on her husband for money; another, from a cold, dead sense of duty; a fourth is not quite as ideal as the other three, because she has weaknesses, hinderances, that they have not; but *the motive* is pure, sacred love for her husband. Shall men say that there is no difference between these wives, or say the first three are even preferable to the last? And yet that is what Prof. James and those who train with him do say; for they compare the Christian life with the life of the mere natural man and even try, in cases, to give the natural man the preference, and give no consideration to the motive.

There is a further difference between the moral, upright unredeemed and the weak redeemed: The moral, upright man is noble Esau, remaining Esau still, save growing a little prouder, a little colder, a

little harder, a little more selfish, a little more careless of, and indifferent to, God's claims upon him as the years come and go, and will continue so for all eternity ("He that is unrighteous let him do unrighteousness still," Rev. 22:11, R.V., hence, "bottomless pit," never ceasing to fall further and further from God); while the weak redeemed man is weak, warped Jacob slowly becoming Israel; He is in the process of purifying himself ("and every man that hath this hope set on Him purifieth himself,"—1 John 3:3, R.V.); slowly, it may be, with many hinderances, but surely,—"the path of the righteous is as the dawning light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day,"—Prov. 4:18, R.V., and there is not among those really redeemed, born again, one exception to this rule, "*Every one* that hath this hope set on Him purifieth Himself,"—1 John 3:3, R.V. If there is one single professing redeemed one of whom this is not true, he is lost, is really unredeemed and not born again.

When Prof. James can call that "healthy-mindedness that looks on all things and sees that they are good," and says, "You make them evil or good by your own thoughts about them," one need not wonder that he can see little difference between real Christians and merely natural men, for he has no standard of right and of morals.

VIII

NO REWARD FOR WORKS BEFORE THE NEW BIRTH

ON one teaching Jews, Christian Scientists, Unitarians, Universalists, infidels and others who reject complete redemption through the Saviour agree with the Scriptures. That teaching is that one's condition beyond the grave will be according to the life this side of the grave. For the unredeemed that is the teaching of God's word, the difference being that Jews, Christian Scientists, Unitarians, Universalists, infidels, etc., label it Heaven and the Scriptures call it Hell. That teaching means different conditions beyond the grave, according to one's life here; the Scriptures teach this: "These shall receive the *greater* condemnation,"—Mark 12:40, R.V.; "It shall be *more tolerable* for Tyre and Sidon at the day of judgment than for you—It shall be *more tolerable* for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment, than for thee,"—Matt. 11:22, 24; the one who knows his Master's will and does it not, shall be beaten with *many* stripes; the one who is ignorant, shall be beaten with *few* stripes (Luke 12:47, 48).

This teaching of different degrees in future punishment means that no one will be treated wrong in

196 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

Hell, that God is just; that, whatever Hell will be, no one will ever suffer there one pang too much or too little.

But Heaven is the place and the condition where none of the evil consequences of this life's sins will follow us, and this solely because of pure love and grace from God through Christ. Hell is justice; Heaven is grace.

But in Heaven there will be differences of condition, differences of reward, just as there will be differences in Hell, different degrees of punishment. The Saviour said, "I give unto them eternal life,"—John 10:28; and He also said, "Lay up for yourselves treasures in Heaven,"—Matt. 6:20. The servant who has one pound and gains ten pounds, receives as reward rulership over ten cities; while the one who has the same opportunity, one pound, and gains only five pounds, receives as reward rulership over five cities (Luke 19:16-19). The apostle Paul, whether writing of preachers only or of "every man," makes the distinction between salvation and rewards very clear: "Other foundation can no man lay than that that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. Now if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, costly stones, wood, hay, stubble; every man's work shall be made manifest: for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be

burned, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved, yet so as through fire,"—1 Cor. 3:11-15, 1911 Bible.

The reward, then, is for what is built *on the foundation*. Then there is no reward for what is done before the foundation is laid. For all the works done, therefore, before one lays the foundation of Jesus Christ (1 Cor. 3:11), and is born again by the word of God (1 Peter 1:23), he will receive no reward in Heaven. Suppose one is begotten, sanctified by the Spirit (2 Thess. 2:13), and lives many years before he is brought forth (born) by the word of truth (James 1:18, R.V.), is born again by the word of God (1 Peter 1:23), for all the works of those years there will be no reward in Heaven. *The foundation of Jesus Christ must be laid* before the building can be built that will secure the builder any reward.

Take the case of Cornelius: "A devout man, one that feared God with all his house, who gave much alms to the people and prayed to God alway,"—Acts 10:1, 2. Evidently there is here the sanctification of the Spirit (2 Thess. 2:13), but he has not been brought forth (born) by the word of truth (James 1:18, R.V.); he has not believed the truth (2 Thess. 2:13), for God through an angel tells him, "Send to Joppa and call for Simon, whose surname is Peter; who shall tell the words, whereby thou and all thy house shalt be saved,"—Acts 11:13, 14. While his prayers and alms came up as a memorial before God (Acts

198 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

10:4), God leads him to hear the way of salvation, not by devoutness of life, fearing God, giving much alms and praying alway, for he had these (Acts 10:1, 2), but by believing on the Saviour (Acts 10:43), yet for his devout life, his alms, etc., that were before he heard the words of salvation and was saved, there will be no reward in Heaven, for the foundation of Jesus Christ had not been laid, and only for the works built on that foundation will one receive any reward.

There will be no reward, then, for all the works one does before he is begotten or sanctified by the Spirit, nor for the works one does after he is begotten or sanctified by the Spirit but before he is brought forth (born) by the word of truth (James 1:18, R.V.), born again by the word of God (1 Peter 1:23).

If, then, one should, early in life, be begotten or sanctified by the Spirit, and because of realizing some spiritual change, should consider the change conversion, or salvation, and after a long life of service should finally believe the truth (2 Thess. 2:13), be brought forth (born) by the word of truth (James 1:18, R.V.), be born again by the word of God (1 Peter 1:23), there would be no reward in Heaven for this whole life of service; *for the foundation of Jesus Christ had not been laid.*

Granting, then, as the endeavor will be made in the following chapter to show, that all who are begotten or sanctified by the Spirit will some day be led to be-

lieve the truth (2 Thess. 2:13), to be born again by the word of God (1 Peter 1:23), and hence will eventually be saved, *their lives will be lost forever*; they will have no reward in Heaven for all they did before they laid the foundation of Jesus Christ (1 Cor. 3:11), before they were brought forth (born) by the word of truth (James 1:18, R.V.).

For Further Study:—Let not the reader consider as a small matter this loss of reward for all one does after being begotten or sanctified by the Spirit, and before one is born again by the word of God (1 Peter 1:23); for in the Revised Version rendering of Matt. 16:25-27, which is undoubtedly the correct translation here, the Saviour states that to lose one's life, have no reward for the life (see verse 27), and *gain the whole world* thereby, one would have lost and not gained. For one, then, to conclude, because of recognizing in himself a spiritual change, that he is converted or saved, and toward the close of life, to correct the mistake by really believing on Christ, by really laying the foundation of Christ and being born again (1 Peter 1:23), it means a loss greater than if he had gained the whole world.

And for a Christian worker, because he recognizes in one a spiritual change, to tell the person that he is converted, that he is saved, when it is only the begetting or sanctification of the Spirit, even though the person shall in later life believe the truth (2 Thess.

200 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

2:13), lay the foundation of Jesus Christ and be saved (Acts 16:31), and be born again by the word of God (1 Peter 1:23); yet the Christian worker has thereby caused a loss to the person greater than losing the whole world.

It is not the work of the Christian worker to discern the Spirit's work and lead the sinner to base his hope on that; but to point the sinner to the Saviour, the Redeemer. There is no infallible test by which one may know absolutely of the Spirit's work before the sinner has believed on the Saviour; but the Christian worker may know that he is making no mistake when he leads the sinner to believe on the Saviour; for both salvation and the new birth are then sure (Acts 16:31; 1 John 5:1). And even though the sinner shall afterward be saved, it is a fearful, irreparable loss for the sinner to base his hope on some inner spiritual change and not wholly on Christ, for salvation is not in the Spirit's work but wholly in Christ (1 Tim. 1:15) as complete Redeemer (Titus 2:13, 14); and until the sinner sees this and thus believes on the Saviour, all reward for all work done is forever lost. Herein lies one of the great dangers of Mr. Harold Begbie's books, "Twice Born Men," "Souls in Action," and "Other Sheep"; the emphasis is put upon the spiritual change, and not upon redemption and the new birth as resulting from "belief of the truth" (2 Thess. 2:13); and faith in Christ as Saviour, as Redeemer, is left in the background, in some cases not

even mentioned. Many of the touching cases which he gives, possibly all, doubtless were afterward led to faith in Christ, in His dying for our sins (1 Cor. 15:3), but salvation is not in the new spiritual nature, but in Christ and His bearing our sins in His own body on the tree (1 Peter 2:24), in His death for our sins (1 Cor. 15:3).

And herein is the special pleading of Prof. James in his "The Varieties of Religious Experience" fearfully deceptive and misleading. In the data he gathered for his lectures in his book, his cases of "conversion" have to do with some spiritual change which he diagnoses as coming from the "sub-conscious self," and he does not take cases of real salvation through Christ and the new birth "by the word of God" (1 Peter 1:23).

Let not the reader consider that the warning in this chapter as to the loss of rewards is a too material, too matter-of-fact view of Christianity; for the crying need of to-day is that Christianity shall be taken out of the realm of fog and misty theory and made matter-of-fact, touching this life at every step. Men need to realize that every thought, every deed, reaches throughout eternity in its results.

Nor is it appealing to a base motive to appeal to the loss of reward; for Jesus said, "*Lay up for yourselves* treasures in Heaven,"—Matt. 6:20; and He said not to, even though saved, means a loss greater than the whole world (Matt. 16:25-27, R.V.).

IX

ALL WHO ARE BEGOTTEN OR SANCTIFIED BY THE SPIRIT WILL BE BORN AGAIN

WHILE the Spirit convicts the world of sin (John 16:7-11) and many thus convicted resist and turn away, there is a different work of the Spirit in begetting a new spiritual nature (John 1:13), called by the apostle Paul "sanctification of the Spirit" (2 Thess. 2:13). This new nature is brought forth (born) by the word of truth (James 1:18, R.V.), and that which is brought forth (born) is "not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible" (1 Peter 1:23). Now because it is "not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible" every one who is thus begotten or sanctified by the Spirit will some day be born again "by the word of God" (1 Peter 1:23), and will therefore be saved. Hence, the statement of the apostle Paul, "He who *began* a good work *in you* will perfect it until the day of Jesus Christ,"—Phil. 1:6, R.V. If we could know absolutely that a person has been begotten or sanctified by the Spirit, then we could know absolutely that that one some day would be led to believe the truth (2

Thess. 2:13), would be brought forth (born) by the word of truth (James 1:18, R.V.), and would be saved (Acts 16:31).

It is alarming, on first thought, to see that no one is saved, is born again, who has not believed on the Saviour as complete, eternal Redeemer from all iniquity (Heb. 9:12; Titus 2:13, 14; Acts 16:31); for there are many, many devout, God-fearing ones who have not thus believed on the Saviour, who have not ceased from their own works (Rom. 4:5; Heb. 4:10), but are depending on their church, or their baptism, or their prayers or the prayers of others, or their good lives and some mysterious change of spiritual nature, to save or to help save, because they have never grasped the fact that the Saviour *really redeemed*, and from all iniquity (Titus 2:13, 14), and that the service of the redeemed is from love and not from fear of being lost. But if before one thus believes on the Saviour and is born again, he is begotten or sanctified by the Spirit, and if every one thus begotten or sanctified will some day be led to believe on the Saviour and be saved and be born again by the word of God (Acts 16:31; 1 Peter 1:23); if "He who *began* a good work in you *will perfect* it until the day of Jesus Christ,"—Phil. 1:6, R.V., then there is opened up a "larger hope" indeed, a world of blessed, blessed comfort, to realize that not one of those who are really devout and godly and God-fearing, though now in "bondage to fear," though blinded by religious

error, and misled by false teachers, will be lost; that sometime, somewhere, somehow, it may be through a long winding way, with some possibly not before a dying hour, the Spirit will lead them to "belief of the truth" (2 Thess. 2:13), and they will be brought forth (born) by the word of truth (James 1:18, R.V.), be born again by the word of God (1 Peter 1:23); that every devout Cornelius (Acts 10:1, 2) will be led to some Peter who shall tell him words whereby he shall be saved (Acts 11:12-14); that He who began a good work in him will perfect it until the day of Jesus Christ (Phil. 1:6, R.V.).

Take some cases:—Here is an aged, devout, godly Protestant; Cornelius-like, his life manifests the fact that it is not from a nature at enmity with God; yet he is constantly fearing that his life is not good enough to entitle him to Heaven; he is constantly praying that he may be enabled to do his part that he may get to Heaven; blinded by religious error, misled by false teachers, he has never ceased from his own works, when God's word declares plainly, "To him that worketh not but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly his faith is counted for righteousness,"—Rom. 4:5, and "He that is entered into his rest, he also hath ceased from his own works,"—Heb. 4:10; hence, he has never been saved (Eph. 2:8, R.V.); he has never believed the truth (2 Thess. 2:13); he has, therefore, never been born again by the word of God (1 Peter 1:23). Yet

in a dying hour, if not before, he tells the loved ones not to weep, that he is at rest and is going to Heaven, and he sings,

“Safe in the arms of Jesus;”

or

“Sweeping through the gates,
Washed in the blood of the Lamb.”

He was not in this condition throughout that long life of “bondage to fear”; how came he in this condition at last? Consider: he had heard many times, “Christ died for our sins,”—1 Cor. 15:3; “God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have everlasting life,”—John 3:16; “The blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin,”—1 John 1:7; “Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved,”—Acts 16:31; but his religious teacher kept him from grasping, believing, the blessed truth, by constantly thrusting forward the church, baptism or the life as having part to do with salvation, or “salvation by character.” But now there are no more prayers, no more strivings to be good enough to be saved, and God who has said, “He who began a good work in you *will perfect* it until the day of Jesus Christ,”—Phil. 1:16, R.V., by the Spirit brings to his memory (John 16:13) what he has often heard, but never before really laid hold of (1 Cor. 15:3; John 3:16; Acts 16:31), and for the first time he

really believes on the Saviour, rests on him as Redeemer and is—

“Safe in the arms of Jesus.”

Or take, for example, the case of an aged, pious, godly Catholic, all through life under “bondage of fear.” All through life he has been depending on his confessions and other religious rites and ceremonies and services to enable him to reach Heaven; yet all the while there has been the Cornelius-like devoutness and yearning after holiness, and fear of God, the promptings of a nature evidently not at enmity with God. In a dying hour, if not before, he will be led to “belief of the truth” (2 Thess. 2:13). In the dying hour the last mass and extreme unction will have been administered; the crucifix held up before the dying eyes for the last time; nothing more of service remains; but in that hour God who has promised, “He who *began* a good work in you *will perfect* it until the day of Jesus Christ,”—Phil. 1:6, R.V., through the Spirit gives him a clear mind, and that cross just gazed upon reminds him that that meant God’s Son who died for our sins (1 Cor. 15:3), and he has often heard, “God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have everlasting life,”—John 3:16, but never before grasped it; and now, for the first time, he really rests upon Christ for salvation, and tells the weeping wife and children that all is well.

Take a case in point: in one of the mining camps of Colorado, one night far past midnight a minister was aroused by hurried knocking at his door. It was an urgent call to come immediately to see an earnest, pious, God-fearing woman who was dying. Though a devout, godly woman, she had never been at rest concerning her salvation; yet the Saviour promised positively, "Come unto Me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest,"—Matt. 11:28; and equally positively God's word says, "We which have believed do enter into rest,"—Heb. 4:3. The minister laid before the dying woman Is. 53:5, 6, "He was wounded for our transgressions; He was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon Him; and with His stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all." He explained to her that it was not the church, nor baptism, nor devoutness of life that saves, nor helps save, but Christ's dying for our sins (1 Cor. 15:3); that Christ's dying for our sins was not for a part of our sins, but all of them ("our Saviour Jesus Christ who gave Himself for us, that He might redeem us from *all iniquity*,"—Titus 2:13, 14); that Christ's redeeming us from all iniquity settles the question of all of our sins if we accept Him as Saviour; that "God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have ever-

lasting life,"—John 3:16; that when the jailer asked, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?"—Acts 16:30, the reply was, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved,"—Acts 16:31; that to believe on Christ meant to cease all work to save herself or to help save herself and to trust the whole work of being saved to the Saviour, because God's word says, "To him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness,"—Rom. 4:5; that it meant to commit the whole work of her soul being saved to Christ, and to depend solely on His dying for her sins, because the apostle Paul said, "I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that He is able to keep that which I have committed unto Him against that day,"—2 Tim. 1:12. He then urged her to, then and there, accept the Saviour as her complete Redeemer from all iniquity, and to commit the whole work of her salvation to Him against that day. The dying woman said that she would, and that she would go out into eternity depending on the Saviour's promise, "Him that cometh unto me *I will in no wise cast out*,"—John 6:37. The minister then quoted to her, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth My word, and believeth on Him that sent Me, *HATH everlasting life*, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life,"—John 5:24. When she realized that she was really saved, that it was certain that she was going to Heaven, her tender, quiet, rejoicing

would have touched the hardest heart. Some hours afterward, as she was passing away and too weak to speak, a lady friend by the bedside quoted, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on Me hath everlasting life,"—John 6:47, and the dying woman smiled and the lips moved, but the words could not be heard. Then the lady quoted, "Let not your heart be troubled; ye believe in God, believe also in Me. In My Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you unto Myself; that where I am, there ye may be also,"—John 14:1-3, and the dying woman, smiling and rejoicing, tried to speak, but again could not be heard. The lady friend then began singing,

"Jesus is tenderly calling thee home, calling thee home,"

and the dying woman, smiling to friends, repeatedly tried to speak, but was too weak to be heard; and as the last line of the hymn was sung, with a smile on her face she brought her hands together and they fell upon her breast and she was gone, leaving the smile still upon the lifeless face.

But some one may fear that God may not, in every case, sooner or later, bring to "belief of the truth" (2 Thess. 2:13) those who have been previously begotten or sanctified by the Spirit. The fear is ground-

less, for "He who *began* a good work in you will *perfect* it until the day of Jesus Christ,"—Phil. 1:6, R.V.

For Further Study:—The fact that in the first epistle of John repeated stress is laid on one's having been begotten of God is evidence that all thus begotten will eventually be saved, be born again by the word of God (1 Peter 1:23).

Because of not being able with certainty to tell that one's inclining to devoutness and holiness is from the begetting or sanctification of the Spirit, we are liable to be misled, but there is an infallible test that one has been begotten or sanctified by the Spirit, "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is begotten of God,"—1 John 5:1, R.V. (or has been begotten). When one believes that Jesus is the Christ, the Redeemer, rests upon, accepts Him in His real character as the Christ, without exception that one has been begotten of God. This is also taught in John 1:12, 13, "As many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the children of God, even to them that believe on His name; who were born [Revised Version, begotten], not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God,"—were begotten previous to believing on His name; and every one, "as many as."

X

CLOSING WORDS WITH THE READER

THESE closing words are for two classes of readers: first, those who are Christian workers trying to lead others to be saved; second, those who are unsaved.

To the first class: while there is comfort in the teaching that all who are really begotten or sanctified by the Spirit will, at some time before life's close, in some way, be led to believe on Christ; that all who are really devout and yearning after God will be led to be saved, to "belief of the truth" (2 Thess. 2:13), to be born again by the word of God (1 Peter 1:23), will be brought forth (born) by the word of truth (James 1:18, R.V.), no Christian worker should, because of evidences of this work of the Spirit, conclude that the person is saved, and so stop short of leading the person to really *believe on the Saviour* (Acts 16:31). No one is ever saved who stops short of "belief of the truth" (2 Thess. 2:13), and that truth is that *Christ died for our sins* (1 Cor. 15:3). It is *redemption* that the sinner needs and that he *must* have, or he never will be saved. "Apart from shedding of blood *there is no remission,*"—Heb. 9:22,

R.V. It is a fatal delusion to call that conversion, or salvation, that does not rest solely upon the redemption through the blood of Christ.

If one who has for years been trying to do the work of an evangelist may be allowed a criticism, the author would say that the wide and rapid increase of religious error in recent years has come from three kinds of spurious evangelism:—

The first has been that type of evangelism that has reiterated, "Believe! Believe! Believe!" without answering the all-important question, "Believe what?"

Years ago one of our larger American cities was stirred by a then great and popular evangelist. He was a marvellous organizer and manipulator and advertiser. His work, in crowds and newspaper notoriety, eclipsed that of Mr. Moody in the same city years before. The praises of the wonderful young evangelist were upon almost every tongue; the newspapers were daily publishing his sermons. A young minister dared state to his fellow-ministers that the evangelist was not preaching the Gospel at all, and it brought down upon him a storm of disapproval. "Why," they replied, "he is preaching in every sermon for the sinners to believe, to believe." "But believe what?" was the reply of the young minister. "He has never told the people *what* to believe; that the Gospel is that Christ died for our sins (1 Cor. 15:1-3); that our Saviour gave Himself for us that He might redeem us from all iniquity (Titus 2:13, 14); that the Lord

hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all (Is. 53:6); that He His own self bore our sins in His own body on the tree (1 Peter 2:24)." To-day that evangelist (and alas!—some of his admirers) denies the deity of the Saviour; denies the necessity of any real redemption. Of course, as many other infidels do, to catch the unwary, or to avoid the odium of being known as an infidel, he uses the words "faith," "atonement," "vicarious suffering," "redemption," etc., but with a totally different meaning from the plain Scripture teaching. This type of evangelism cries, "Accept Jesus! Accept Jesus! Accept the Saviour," without, however, telling how Jesus saves; what it is that really saves. There are human beings with the name "Jesus"; there are mere human beings who were called "the Saviour," and they have been "accepted."

Let it be clearly understood that no one is saved, is a real Christian, is really born again, who has not accepted Jesus as *Redeemer*; who has not accepted the Saviour as *Redeemer*, as the one who "died for our sins" (1 Cor. 15:2); as the one "who gave Himself for us that He might redeem us from all iniquity" (Titus 2:13, 14).

The second type of spurious evangelism has been that which has aimed at arousing the emotions. The evangelist of this type has not "opened his mouth and began at the same Scripture [Isaiah 5:3] and preached unto him Jesus," but by blood-curdling illus-

trations or pathetic appeals to human ties and earthly emotions, has aroused the emotions of the people, sometimes to frenzy, and labelled as conversions those thus affected. Some of them are afterward swept into fanaticism; others, after the spell is broken, fall back into utter indifference, concluding that they have had all there is in Christianity, and that there is nothing in it.

The third type is that which sweeps over a community in a wave of moral reform; and when the powerful evangelist by appeals for better living has led many to take a stand to live better lives, these are written down as converts.

It is little wonder that, with the soil thus prepared by these three types of evangelism, the shrewd religious errorist sows his seed and quickly reaps a bountiful harvest.

Let the Christian worker keep constantly in mind that he is dealing with the eternal destiny of human beings; that his thoughtless work or his wrong teaching may lead to a soul being forever lost; that, even though the person may be begotten or sanctified by the Spirit and be eventually led to be saved, his getting the person to be satisfied with an inner spiritual change and calling it conversion or salvation will leave the person in bondage to fear and will cause the person to lose all reward for all eternity. It is no wonder that the apostle Paul, facing the solemn, the awe-inspiring responsibility of dealing with souls, and real-

izing the eternal consequences, exclaimed, "Who is sufficient for these things?"—2 Cor. 2:16.

But the Christian worker need not hesitate. Supported by many infallible proofs that the Scriptures are really, absolutely, a revelation from God, among them one alone is all-sufficient to any earnest, honest man,—the fulfilled prophecies,—*he may know* that when he has led his fellow-man to depend for salvation solely, completely upon the redemption that is in Christ Jesus whom God has set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His blood, a redemption from all iniquity (Titus 2:13, 14), an eternal redemption (Heb. 9:12), through Christ giving Himself for our sins (Gal. 1:4); through Christ dying for our sins (1 Cor. 15:3),—*he may know* that he has made no mistake, but that he has led a fellow-man to be saved (Eph. 2:8, R.V.); that the man thus led to be saved is born again (1 Peter 1:23), and is sure of Heaven.

Let the author plead with the reader who is a Christian worker to strive to realize the eternal issues of his work, and to not be like some theological teachers and some university professors who warp the simple meaning of the Scriptures and cut the very heart out of the gospel with the seeming indifference of children knocking down toy houses, or tearing up a skeleton map, not facing the awful responsibility that they are dealing with souls, and that if their theories are wrong every one who follows them will spend eternity in Hell.

216 REDEMPTION AND THE NEW BIRTH

Some closing words for the unsaved reader:—

In less than one hundred years from the time the reader reads these words his life will have ended. If, as the atheist claims, this life is all,—there is nothing beyond,—neither the reader nor any one else will ever know it. But if there is, and the fulfilled prophecies and many other infallible proofs give us a solid foundation on which to rest and to rely on the teaching of the Saviour that there is something beyond the grave, then it is of tremendous importance that the reader rest on no false hope; that he be not swept away by religious prejudice; nor by high-sounding titles of writers of new-spun theories who write as if “whatever is possible is probable and whatever is probable is therefore certain”; nor by new-born religions whose greatest claims upon men consist of ridicule and sneers and assumed airs of superiority to God’s word and to our Lord and Saviour. To be thus swept away, it will be no comfort to the reader when in Hell he remembers that in carelessness, or pride, or because of love of the world, or because of secret sin, or public sin, or religious prejudice, he allowed himself to be misled by these modern false lights. What the unsaved reader needs, what he ought to have, what he may have, is a hope “as an anchor of the soul both sure and steadfast,”—Heb. 6:19.

And this sure and steadfast hope is not something dark and deep and mysterious, which is beyond the reach of common people. “God so loved *the world*,”

—John 3:16; then the world, the great common people, both the learned and the ignorant, can have this sure and steadfast hope for all that is beyond this life. If God loves the world, and the great body of the world are plain, common people, the vast part of them ignorant, then the reader may know that this hope is something simple and plain and sure, and not something deep and mysterious, Herbert Spencer-Darwin-Huxley-like, something so deep and dark and mysterious that great university professors *must* get confused and bewildered in trying to understand it. Their bewilderment and confusion do not come from trying to understand it, but from *trying to get around it*. And it will ever confuse and forever confound those who do try to get around it.

That it can be grasped by ignorant and learned alike witness on the one hand the multiplied thousands of the lowest who have been saved through the Salvation Army and vast multitudes of others; and on the other hand, witness Sir David Brewster, Agassiz, Arnold Guyot, Henry Drummond, W. E. Gladstone, Lord Kelvin, John A. Broadus, James Orr, James Denny and a host of others.

But what the unsaved reader needs is to have this sure and steadfast hope for the beyond made personal. There is much that will never be understood in this life; there are questions ever arising in each life that must wait for the life beyond for an answer, or forever remain unanswered. There are mysteries

that will never be solved here; but *the reader can make sure of Heaven.*

The peace, the rest, from having the great question of the soul's eternal destiny settled is worthy the most earnest, attentive and conscientious consideration from the reader. To realize that one has a new spiritual nature, born "not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible,"—1 Peter 1:23; that he is redeemed from all iniquity (Titus 2:13, 14); that he has, here and now, everlasting life and shall not come into condemnation (John 5:24); that all fear and dread have been forever taken away and the motive of love is in their place; that in the resurrection there will be given a new purified body (Rom. 8:23; 1 Cor. 15:42, 43); and that Heaven, whatever and wherever it may be, is sure to be his future home, and forever,—these are enough to lead the reader to "give the more earnest heed."

But how can the reader make sure of Heaven? "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and *thou shalt be saved*,"—Acts 16:31; "For God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have everlasting life,"—John 3:16; "To him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness,"—Rom. 4:5. You *must be justified*, and there is no other way. And when you have believed on Him and are justified, saved, you are born of God (1 John 5:1).

CLOSING WORDS WITH THE READER 219

Reader, not long and you will see Him face to face who loved you and gave Himself for you (Gal. 2:20), or you will be in what the Jews, the Unitarians, the Universalists, the Christian Scientists, the infidels, call Heaven, but what God's word calls Hell; and even there you will find that God will be just to you. But there is something better for you if you will have it.

One of the most brilliant men of modern times was Henry Drummond. Though himself redeemed, having accepted Christ as complete Redeemer from all iniquity, he failed to make Redemption his chief theme in his life's work, and at the end of his life he regretted it and saw his mistake. One who knew tells of his life's close: "He knew he was dying. He had not made the Cross the chief work of his ministry. He had felt that his office was to lead men to the wicket gate. But the Cross had been the secret motive of his soul. In his dying hour a friend played softly some of the sweetest hymns. He listened in silence; at last there was sung, to the old Scots melody of Martyrdom, the simple verse:—

"I'm not ashamed to own my Lord,
Or to defend His cause,
Maintain the glory of His cross,
And honor all His Laws."

"The dying spirit was roused. He beat time with his hands. He joined softly in the words; when the song ceased, he said, 'There is nothing to beat that.'"

It is said that when Sir David Brewster lay dying, his physician told him of his condition, and passing out of the sick-room informed his daughter. She came in and sitting down by the bedside said, "Father, before morning you will see Charlie, will you not?" Charles was her little brother who had died. The dying scientist replied, "I'll see Jesus." Thinking that her father did not understand her, she repeated, "But, father, before morning you will see Charlie, will you not?" The great scientist replied, "Ah! I'll see Jesus, who gave Himself for me."

May it be so with you, reader, at life's close and with each reader of this book.

The pen lingers: Oh for some closing word that would lead the reader to make sure of Heaven!

"Now we see as through a glass dimly; but then face to face; now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known,"—I Cor. 13:12.

THE MINISTER AND HIS WORK

THISELTON MARK, D. Lit.

The Pedagogics of Preaching

A Short Essay in Practical Homiletics. Net

Much has been done for the Teacher in showing him the practical application in his work of the findings of the new Psychology, but comparatively little has been done in the field of "Psychology and Preaching." This scholarly and yet popular book applies to the art of preaching methods which have long been followed in the training of teachers.

FRANK W. GUNSAULUS, D.D.

The Minister and The Spiritual Life

Yale Lectures on Preaching for 1911. Net \$1.25.

Among the phases of this vital subject treated by the pastor of The Central Church, Chicago, are: The Spiritual Life and Its Expression in and Through Ministering; The Spiritual Life in View of Changes in Philosophical and Theological View-Points; The Spiritual Life in Its Relation to Truth and Orthodoxy; The Spiritual Life and Present Social Problems, etc.

PROF. A. T. ROBERTSON, D.D.

The Glory of the Ministry

Paul's Exultation in Preaching. Cloth, net \$1.25.

Rev. F. B. Meyer says: "I think it is the best of all your many books and that is saying a good deal. Its illuminating references to the Greek text, its graphic portraiture of the great Apostle, its allusions to recent literature and current events, its pointed and helpful instructions to the ministry combine to give it very special value."

SAMUEL CHARLES BLACK, D.D.

Building a Working Church

12mo, cloth, net \$1.25.

Every pastor or church officer no matter how successful he may be, will find practical, vital suggestions for strengthening some weak place in his present organization. The author makes every chapter bear directly upon some specific phase of the church building problem.

WILLIAM E. BARTON, D. D.

Rules of Order for Religious Assemblies

8mo, cloth, net 50c.

This work is entirely undenominational and will be found adapted to use in any religious assembly whether church, council, association or convention.

DEVOTIONAL STUDIES

G. CAMPBELL MORGAN

Sunrise: Behold He Cometh Cloth, net 50c.

"This is a little book which deals with Christ's second coming. Dr. Morgan discusses in his reasonable, satisfying and preeminently spiritual way this subject which should have the serious consideration of every Christian."
—*Northwestern Christian Advocate.*

S. D. GORDON

Quiet Talks About Our Lord's Return

12mo, cloth, net 75c.

In the Preface of this new volume in the Quiet Talks Series, the author says: "In my boyhood days I heard much from Mr. Moody's lips about our Lord's return. Later I became rather confused over the different teachings regarding it until it was practically pushed out of my working program. Then I was led to pick up the Bible afresh on this subject. The result finally arrived at has profoundly affected my outlook as a follower of Jesus Christ."

S. D. GORDON

Prayer Changes Things Boards, net 35c.

16mo, boards, net 35c.

To that great army of Christians throughout the world who are in quest of devotional and inspirational literature will come as an exposition of a most vexed problem."

—*N. Y. Observer.*

S. D. GORDON

The Quiet Time

Including the "Finnish Gold Story" with Prayer Pages for each Day of the Week. Boards, net 25c.

J. WILBUR CHAPMAN

Power. "Received Ye the Holy Ghost?"

An Appeal to Every Christian. *Revised and Enlarged Edition.* 16mo, cloth, net 50c.

J. C. MASSEE, D.D.

Men and the Kingdom

12mo, cloth, net 75c.

A study of the relation of the men of to-day to the establishment of the Kingdom of Heaven on earth. The work is a vision and a prophecy of a dawning day.

STUDIES AND PROBLEMS

JAMES M. BUCKLEY

The Wrong and Peril of Woman Suffrage

12mo, cloth, net 75c.

"Dedicated to men and women who look before they leap."

"Dr. Buckley is dispassionate, calm and sane. He presents in permanent form some of the most logical thoughts in opposition to the clamor for suffrage."—*Detroit Free Press*.

HENRY W. CLARK

Studies in the Making of Character

16mo, cloth, net 75c.

"It is a live book. It sparkles with living gems. Its reading will be a delight, and its practice will produce a character that will be a joy forever."—*Heidelberg Teacher*.

SIR JOSEPH COMPTON-RICKETT

Origins and Faith

8vo, cloth, net \$1.50.

"A very earnest and a very fine attempt to deal with current difficulties. The author's faith is pious to its origins. We recognize in him a more literary touch, a more genial note, a more sympathetic faith than is felt in his predecessors."—*British Weekly*.

L. L. NASH, D. D.

Early Morning Scenes in the Bible

12mo, Cloth, net \$1.00.

A series of very refreshing and helpful studies of events recorded in the Scriptures associated with early morning hours. The freshness with which the author has dealt with his subjects suggests the style of Dr. MacDuff.

DOREMUS SCUDDER

The Passion for Reality

16mo, cloth, net, 50c.

"It is vital with a living, working faith. Characterized by a spirit well expressed in the title of the book, and the quotations show a wide range of reading and a wise selective ability."—*The Outlook*.

LEN G. BROUGHTON, D. D.

Kingdom of Heaven

An Exposition of
Matthew XIII

12mo, cloth, in press.

An exposition of the parables dealing with the Kingdom of Heaven found in the XIII chapter of Matthew.

EVANGELISTIC

PHILIP I. ROBERTS

The Dry Dock of a Thousand Wrecks

THE MCAULEY WATER ST. MISSION

With Introduction by Dr. J. H. Jowett. A sequel to "Down in Water Street." Cloth, net \$1.00.

Since the publication of DOWN IN WATER STREET, a great body of testimony has grown up at the old McAuley Mission with which Mr. Hadley's book does not deal, and concerning which nothing of a permanent character has hitherto been published. These men whose life stories are included in the present volume, are living witnesses of the uplifting grace of God. As Dr. Jowett says: "These 'thousand wrecks' have not only been taken into 'dry dock' and repaired; they are out again and engaged in scouring the seas for human ships."

J. WILBUR CHAPMAN, D.D.

The Personal Touch

Inspiration for Christian Workers. *International Leaders' Library.* 12mo, cloth, net 50c.

"If ever a book was timely it is this—will be read with delight and profit."—*Methodist Recorder.*

SAM JONES

Sam Jones' Revival Sermons

Compiled by his daughter, Annie Jones Pyron. Net \$1.00

These selected sermons by the famous evangelist have a heart quality that enforces their messages of love and sympathy even divorced as they are from the voice of that master pleader for the souls of men.

T. T. MARTIN

God's Plan with Men

An Interpretation of Salvation. 12mo, cloth, net \$1.

This comprehensive survey of God's methods in dealing with mankind is the ripe fruit of a lifetime of experience in interpreting God's truths to men.

CHURCH MUSIC

Edited by CHARLES M. ALEXANDER

Alexander's Male Choir

An entirely new Hymn Book. 12mo, boards, net 50c.; \$40.00 per hundred; carriage extra.

Ira S. Dodd, D.D., and Prof. Lindsay B. Longacre, Ph.D.

The Riverdale Hymn Book for Churches

8vo, cloth, 534 pages with Responsive Readings, net \$1.25.

SPECIAL PRICES FOR INTRODUCTION.



BT775 .M37 1913

Martin, Thomas Theodore,
Redemption and the new birth

